GRAPESHOT AND CANISTER

ALLEN HILL AUTRY

Central BAPTIST
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
presented by

W. A. JARREL

KANSAS CITY, KANSAS

Board Bap., 59
Education, Schools & gre
Gospel promoters, 7
Hardshellism ori
rated with Dan
rker - the "Two Seed," 12

GRAPESHOT AND CANISTER

FROM THE ARSENAL OF TRUTH ON MISSION METHODS

Compliments

BY

of

ALLEN HILL AUTRY

Teacher-Evangelist; Editor Doctrinal Interpreter; Associate Editor Baptist Advance; Associate Editor Baptist Forum

WITH INTRODUCTION

BY

REVEREND BENJAMIN COX

Pastor First Baptist Church, Little Rock, Ark.

Missions
Title
8331

THE DOCTRINAL INTERPRETER
LITTLE ROCK, ARKANSAS
1911

LIBRARY
CENTRAL BAPTIST SEMINARY
KANSAS CITY 2, KANSAS

COPYRIGHT BY ALLEN HILL AUTRY
1911

286.1767
A941

INTRODUCTION.

It is with great joy and thanksgiving that I welcome the publication of this book. In my humble judgment no man in the State of Arkansas is better fitted for the great and important task which Bro. Autry has here assumed. I bespeak for it a very wide reading, not only among Arkansas Baptists, but among many others. All who are really interested in standing upon foundation principles can well afford to pay attention to it. Missionary Baptists are either right or wrong. If they are wrong, they should change their belief and practice. If they are right, they should be more zealous in propagating the principles for which they stand.

In this book the claim is made that from the earliest times Baptists have had conventions and associations in their denominational work, very much as we have them today. Arkansas Baptists are in a position to be greatly helped by this timely discussion.

It is apparent that great distress has come to individuals and churches, because of the extravagant and unbiblical position taken by many people.

Extremists have strained at gnats and swallowed camels in this regard. Every Baptist ought to be well acquainted with the history of his own denomination. Surely, Missionary Baptists have great cause to thank God and take

9331

courage when they read the early history of their brethren in the faith.

It is a fact conceded by prominent historians, other than Baptists, that the Christian world owes a great debt to Baptists for the religious liberty which they enjoy.

It is my hope and prayer that Bro. Autry's faithful labors may be rewarded by a very extensive circulation of this book, and that great good may be done wherever it is read.

BENJAMIN COX,
Pastor, First Baptist Church.

Little Rock, Ark.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
Introduction, by Rev. Ben. Cox	3
Scripture Argument	7
Conventions and Associations, Historical Argument	29
Landmarkism an Innovation	63
Headed Toward Hardshellism, Tom Watson and Others Reviewed	91
The Landmark Secession	137
Addenda: Why Clark, Scarboro, Milburn and Ben. M. Bogard Left the Convention	146

CHAPTER I.

The Scripture Argument.

The missionary enterprise originated in heaven, prompted by infinite love. Eph. 1:3-12; Jno. 3:16. It was dimly disclosed to our first parents in the garden of Eden, soon after the fall, Gen. 3:15; more fully developed to Abram in the promise that in his Seed, Christ, should "all the families of the earth be blessed." Gen. 12:1-2, 22:18; Gal. 3:6. This missionary spirit was still more clearly revealed by Jehovah to the Prophets in successive promises. Psa. 2:8; Isa. 2:2; 35:1; 54:2-3; 60:1-10; 61:1-3; 66:8; Dan. 7:27; 12.4; Hab. 2:14. Thus promise after promise was given from time to time, more fully developing the origin and purpose of missions, until the Son of Righteousness himself arose upon our world, and the angel appeared to the astonished shepherds on the plains of Bethlehem, saying: "Fear not, for behold I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to ALL people." Lu. 2:10-11.

To this end our Lord announced at the beginning of His missionary labors that the "Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost." Lu. 19:10. He proclaimed that "this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world, for a witness to all nations, and then shall the end come." Matt. 24:14. From the very beginning the New Testament church was a missionary

P. J. LIBRARY
K. C. K.
BAPTIST SEMINARY

church. When Christ constituted his church of the disciples of John the Baptist He declared that he would make them "fishers of men." Matt. 4:18-22. Afterward He called the twelve and sent them forth as missionaries to preach the gospel of the kingdom. Matt. 10:1-7; Mark 3:13-14.

Later He sent out seventy evangelists into every city and place whither He himself should go. Luke 10:1-10. And, finally, He gave His disciples the world-wide commission, Matt. 28:19-20, and bade them tarry at Jerusalem for witness-bearing power. Luke 24:48-49; Acts 1:8. He made them missionaries when He said, GO, and He made them missionary preachers when he said, GO, PREACH THE GOSPEL; and he made them Missionary Baptist Preachers when he said, GO, PREACH and BAPTIZE; and he made them world-wide Missionary Baptists when he said, GO INTO ALL THE WORLD, make disciples of all the nations, baptize and teach; and He made it impossible for them to work in the wrong place when He said, GO into *all the world;* and he made it impossible for them to leave out anybody when He said: Preach the gospel to *every creature;* and He made it their duty to train them for service when He said: Teach them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and He made it impossible for them to be lonely when He said: Lo, I am with you all the days, even to the end of the age; and He made it impossible for this Missionary enterprise to fail when He said: "Upon this Rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Matt. 28:19-20; Mark 16:15-16; Matt. 16:18; and He gave them the privilege of using any method

in the prosecution of the missionary enterprise which would be in harmony with the spirit of their mission when He said: "GO INTO ALL THE WORLD," without giving them specific directions as to HOW to GO.

THE CHURCH AND A CALLED MINISTRY

of course, were His chief agents in the prosecution of all missionary enterprises. (Mark 3:13-19; Luke 6:12-17; 1 Cor. 12:28-29; Matt. 28:19-20; Matt. 10:1-10; Luke 10:1-12; Acts 13:1-3; Rom. 10:13-15; 1 Cor. 9:1-14.) They were not tied up, however, to any given method of reaching the nations. When they thought best they made division of the territory according to the adaptation of the workers:

"And when James, Peter, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision." (Gal. 2:9.)

For convenience they were allowed to divide their work into City, State, Home and Foreign Missions:

"But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Spirit has come upon you; and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." (Acts 1:8.)

Churches co-operated with each other at will, and by their own methods. Sometimes they communicated with each other by means of traveling agents:

"And we have sent with him the brother, whose praise is in the gospel throughout all the churches." (2 Cor. 8:18.)

"But I have all, and abound; I am full, having received of Epahproditus the things which were sent from you, an odor of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to God." (Phil. 4:18.)

Sometimes they used boards as means of co-operation between churches:

"Whether any do enquire of Titus, he is my partner and fellow-helper concerning you; or our brethren be enquired of, they are the messengers of the churches, and the glory of Christ." (2 Cor. 8:23.)

This Board handled the funds sent by the churches:

"And we have sent with Titus the brother, whose praise is in the gospel throughout all the churches; and not that only, but who was also chosen of the churches to travel with us with this contribution, which is administered by us to the glory of the same Lord, and declaration of your ready mind." (2 Cor. 8:18-19.)

The churches were requested by the Apostle to report to this board, and to demonstrate their love for the cause by their gifts:

"Wherefore show ye to them (the Board which handled the funds), and before the churches, the proof of your love, and of our boasting on your behalf." (2 Cor. 8:24.)

They had a Corresponding Secretary, who urged them to make ready their gifts and turn the same over to the Board whose duty it was to handle such funds:

"For as touching the ministry to the saints, it is superfluous for me to write to you; for I know the forwardness of your mind, for which I boast of you to them of Macedonia, that Achaia was ready a year ago; and your zeal hath provoked very many. Yet have I sent the brethren,

lest our boasting of you should be in vain in this behalf; that, as I said, ye may be ready." (2 Cor. 9:1-3.)

They had a Superintendent of Missions, who in love had the care of all the churches in respect to mission work, and who sent men to visit the churches whenever he thought it would promote the cause of Christ:

"And we have sent with him the brother, whose praise is in the gospel throughout all the churches; and we have SENT with them our brother, whom we have oftentimes proved diligent in many things, but now much more diligent, upon the great confidence which I have in you." (2 Cor. 8:18, 22.)

"Besides those things that are without, that which cometh upon me daily, the care of all the churches." (2 Cor. 11:28.)

Sometimes the Corresponding Secretary would write them and appeal to their denominational pride, and send some agent to stir them up by the example of others: "For I know the forwardness of your mind, for which I boast of you to them of Macedonia, that Achaia was ready a year ago; and your zeal hath provoked very many. Yet have I sent the brethren, lest our boasting of you should be in vain in this behalf; that, as I said, ye may be ready; lest haply if they of Macedonia come with me, and find you unprepared, we (that we say not ye) should be ashamed in this same confident boasting. Therefore, I thought it necessary to exhort the brethren, that they would go before unto you, and make up beforehand your contribution, whereof ye had notice before, that the same might be ready, as a matter of bounty and not as of covetousness." (2 Cor. 9:2-5.)

Sometimes an enterprise would be launched by an individual, and he would go of his own accord and stir up the churches:

"But thanks be to God who put the same earnest care into the heart of Titus for you, for indeed he accepted the exhortation; and being more forward, of his own accord he went unto you." (2 Cor. 8:16-17.)

Sometimes the CHURCH would take the initiative:

"Then tidings of these things came unto the ears of the Church, which was at Jerusalem; and they sent forth Barnabas, that he should go as far as Antioch." (Acts 11:22.)

Sometimes the preachers and teachers, the leaders of the Church, would take the first step and arouse the churches to a sense of their duty:

"Now there were in the Church that was at Antioch, certain prophets and teachers, as Barnabas, and Simeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen, who had been brought up with Herod the tetrarch, and Saul; as THEY ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Spirit said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when THEY had fasted and prayed, and laid THEIR hands on them, THEY sent them away." (Acts 13:1-3.)

Sometimes missionaries would be sent out by a Board of Missions, and the churches would be asked to support them while on the mission field:

"And when James, and Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship; that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision." (Gal. 2:9.)

"I robbed other churches, taking WAGES of them to do you service. And when I was present with you and wanted, I was chargeable to no man; for that which was lacking to me the brethren which came from Macedonia (Board of Missions, 2 Cor. 8:23) supplied." (2 Cor. 12:8-9.)

Sometimes an individual would appoint a missionary and assign him his field; and that, too, on his own motion:

"Then departed Barnabas to Tarsus for to seek Saul; and when he had found him, he brought him unto Antioch. And it came to pass that a whole year they assembled themselves with the church, and taught much people." (Acts 11:24-25.) "Then came he to Derbe and Lystra; and, behold, a certain disciple was there, named Timotheus, HIM would Paul have to go forth with him." (Acts 16:1-3.)

Sometimes the missionaries would adopt their own plans and places of work, and choose their own helpers:

"And some days after, Paul said unto Barnabas, Let us go again and visit our brethren in every city where we have preached the word of the Lord, and see how they do. And Barnabas determined to take with them John, whose surname was Mark. But Saul thought not good to take him with them, who parted from them from Pamphilia, and went not with them to the work. And the contention was so sharp between them that they departed asunder one from the other; and so Barnabas took Mark and sailed unto Cyprus; and Paul chose Silas, and departed," etc. (Acts 15:36-41.)

Sometimes the Corresponding Secretary would recommend a religious worker to the churches, and insist that

they help the work on the plea that said Christian worker had been a great help to the Secretary:

"I commend unto you Phebe our sister, who is a servant of the Church which is at Cenchrea; that ye receive her in the Lord, as becometh saints, and that ye assist her in whatsoever business she hath need of you; for she hath been a succurer of many, and of myself also." (Rom. 16:1-2.)

"But I trust in the Lord to send Timotheus shortly unto you, that I also may be of good comfort when I hear of your state; for I have no man likeminded who will naturally care for your state. Yet I supposed it necessary to send to you Epaphroditus, my brother, and companion in labor, and fellow-soldier, but your messenger, and he that ministered to my wants." (Phil. 2:19, 20, 25.) "All my state shall Tychicus declare unto you, who is my beloved brother, and a faithful minister and fellow-servant in the Lord: whom I have sent unto you for the same purpose, that he might know your state, and comfort your hearts." (Col. 4:7, 8.)

Sometimes the Corresponding Secretary would send agents to win them to the plans which he had adopted, which he thought best for the progress of the churches:

"Did I make a gain of you by any of them whom I sent unto you? I desired Titus, and with him I sent a brother. Did Titus make a gain of you? Walked we not in the same spirit? Walked we not in the same steps?" (2 Cor. 12:17, 18.)

In New Testament times the Corresponding Secretary never apologized for his position, but he taught them that what he did was for their good and edification: "Think

ye that we excuse ourselves unto you? We speak before God in Christ; but we do all things, dearly beloved, for your edifying." (2 Cor. 12:19.)

New Testament churches co-operated on the numerical basis in their conventions; small churches might have three or four messengers, while churches numbering thousands were represented by all the members present:

"When, therefore, Paul and Barnabas had no small dissension and disputation with them, they determined that Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of them, should go up to Jerusalem unto the Apostles and Elders about this question. And when they were come to Jerusalem, they were received of the Church, and of the Apostles and Elders, and they declared all things that God had done with them. Then pleased it the Apostles and Elders, with the whole Church, to send chosen men of their own company to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas," etc. (Acts 15:2, 4, 22.)

The method adopted by some crude Baptists of late in allowing a church of fifty members to be represented by as many messengers as a church of five thousand members, is both unfair and unscriptural.

New Testament Churches were taught to support their ministry, and to help in every laudable enterprise:

"Even so hath the Lord ordained that they who preach the gospel should live of the gospel." (1 Cor. 9:14.) "Let him that is taught in the word communicate unto him that teacheth in all good things." (Gal. 6:6.)

They would sometimes make appropriations for the most needy fields, going sometimes beyond their ability in helping the churches:

"For to their power I bear record, yea, and beyond their power, they were willing of themselves; praying us with much entreaty that we would receive the contribution, and take upon us the fellowship of the ministering to the saints." (2 Cor. 8:3, 4.)

They were taught to provide for this fund by regular weekly offerings:

"Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come." (1 Cor. 16: 1, 2.)

But when the churches failed to make their weekly offerings, the Corresponding Secretary would send Agents of his own choosing to arouse them to duty, and to take their offerings; sometimes they were willing, but they were neglectful and inactive, and it was necessary for one who was absorbed in the work to stir up their pure minds by way of remembrance:

"For I know the forwardness of your mind, for which I boast to them of Macedonia, that Achaia was ready a year ago; and your zeal hath provoked very many. Yet have I SENT the brethren, lest our boasting of you should be in vain in this behalf; that, as I said, ye may be ready. Therefore I thought it necessary to exhort the brethren, that they would go before unto you, and make up beforehand your contribution, that the same might be ready." (2 Cor. 9:1-5.)

The churches were also expected to pay the traveling expenses of their general Agents: "And then immediately the brethren sent away Paul; and they that con-

ducted him brought him to Athens." (Acts 17:14, 15.) "Whensoever I take my journey into Spain, I will come to you; for I trust to see you in my journey, and to be BROUGHT on my way thitherward by YOU." (Rom. 15:24.) "And it may be that I will abide, yea, and winter with you, that ye may bring me on my journey whithersoever I go." (1 Cor. 16:6.)

Sometimes the Corresponding Secretary himself handled the funds which had been collected by the churches, just as they do sometimes today:

"But now I go unto Jerusalem to minister unto the saints. For it hath pleased them of Macedonia to make a certain contribution for the poor saints who are at Jerusalem; when, therefore, I have performed this, and have sealed to them this fruit, I will come by you into Spain." (Rom. 15:25-28.)

The churches in those days were expected to give their ministers "HIRE," and to pay them "WAGES," so as to support them without stint:

"The harvest truly is great, but the laborers are few: pray ye, therefore, the Lord of the harvest, that he would send forth laborers into his harvest; for the laborer is worthy of his HIRE." (Luke 10:2, 7.)

"I robbed other churches, taking WAGES of them to do you service." (2 Cor. 11:8.)

New Testament missionaries claimed the right to exact sufficient support to forbear working both for themselves and their families, but sometimes they denied themselves this right and privilege and did not demand it, because of the prejudice and weakness of some of their brethren who might charge them with mercenary motives:

"Mine answer to those that do examine me is this: Have we not power to eat and to drink? Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife, as well as other Apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas? Or I only and Barnabas, have not we power to forbear working? Who goeth a warfare any time at his own charges? Who planteth a vineyard, and eateth not of the fruit thereof? Who feedeth a flock, and eateth not of the milk of the flock? If others be partakers of this power over you, are not we rather? Nevertheless, we have not used this power; but SUFFER all things, lest we should hinder the gospel of Christ." (1 Cor. 9:3-12, 14.)

Such ignorance and prejudice among professed Christians the Apostle once winked at, but it is inexcusable for men and women in this age of the world. All this howl about mercenary Boards and Conventions and preachers, and all these charges of the misappropriation of money by religious bodies, made for the most part by men who, by their own conduct, have lost leadership in the denomination, are born either of malice or prejudice, or both, certainly not of ignorance. In this age when a Bible may be had for five cents, or for nothing, and numerous religious books at a nominal price, such leadership (?) is criminal. And no lawful words are too strong to condemn such a course. When would-be leaders studiously plan to create prejudice in the minds of the uninformed and the unwary, and then appeal to that prejudice to mislead, and to create false impressions, such a course is unthinkable for Christian gentlemen. There is no language too strong in which to describe it; no colors too dark in which to paint it; no measures too radical by

which to condemn it; no pit too deep to which to consign it; and no moment too inopportune in which to urge people to flee from such leadership. But in spite of the efforts of the Corresponding Secretary, the Evangelists, and Agents, and Messengers, and every class of Christian workers, such as Sister Phebe, and brethren Titus and Timothy, et al., in spite of the constant appeals to their denominational pride and the work of their fellow churches; in spite of it all, many of the New Testament churches were laggards, and would not help at all in denominational work. Such churches would use the Evangelist freely without a collection, while the faithful churches were "robbed" to foot the bills: "I robbed other churches, taking wages of them to do YOU service." (2 Cor. 11:8.) They may have objected to the "hired" evangelist, or to the "wage" earning preachers, or to the salary of the travelling Agents, or to their travelling expenses, or to the methods employed in their missionary operations, or what not; whatever might have been their plea for their denominational indifference, still the fact remains that they were not helpers, if the Apostle's word is to be relied on. Hence the Apostle drew the line of demarkation, and declared that such churches "were inferior to other churches, because he had preached to them the gospel without a contribution" (2 Cor. 11:7, 13), and he asked them to "forgive him of this wrong." These laggard, indifferent, do-nothing churches, were usually the most ungrateful churches, just as it is today: "For what is it wherein ye were inferior to other churches, except it be that I myself was not burdensome to you? forgive me this wrong. And I will very gladly spend and be

spent for you; though the more abundantly I LOVE YOU, the LESS I be loved." (2 Cor. 12:13, 15.)

The church which would not help in the denominational enterprises was accounted an "inferior church" in those days; it is so today. The churches of today, as in New Testament times, which do the least to help in any denominational enterprise, are the most ready to cast reproachful aspersions on those who do the most, the quickest to pronounce every aggressive movement an innovation. It has ever been so. At one time it seems that every church in Macedonia, except one church only, refused to adopt the missionary plans of their Superintendent of Missions. To that faithful church their Corresponding Secretary wrote an endearing letter, congratulating them upon their firm and loyal stand with him in all their missionary enterprises:

"Now ye Philippians know also that in the beginning of the gospel, when I departed from Macedonia, no church communicated with me as concerning giving and receiving, but ye only." (Phil. 4:15.)

But as a faithful Corresponding Secretary he continued to write to these delinquent churches, and send them financial Agents; and, with reproofs and rebukes, with tender appeals, and with all the enthusiasm of his missionary soul, by his doctrinal instruction and his heavenly zeal, he tried to set them on fire for God and the cause of missions. (1 Cor. 15:57-16:3; 9:1-14; 2 Cor. 8:1-23; 9:1-7; Gal. 6:6.)

Paul gave the churches specific instructions on the grace of giving, needed as much today, in some parts, as then:

1. They were to give individually: "Let every one of you lay by him in store." (1 Cor. 16:2.)

2. They were to give systematically: "Upon the first day of the week."

3. They were to give proportionately: "As God has prospered him."

4. They were to give bountifully: "He which soweth bountifully, shall reap also bountifully." (2 Cor. 9:6, 7.)

5. They were to give purposefully: "Every man according as he purposeth in his heart, so let him give."

6. They were to give liberally: "Not grudgingly, or of necessity."

7. They were to give cheerfully: "For God loveth a cheerful giver."

They were taught to give from right motives:

1. They were to give and serve from the principle of love:

"If ye love me, keep my commandents." (Jno. 14:15.)

"The love of Christ constraineth us." (2 Cor. 5:14.)

2. They were to give out of gratitude to God:

"For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich. Now therefore perform the doing of it; that, as there was a readiness to will, so there may be a performance also out of that which ye have. For if there be first a willing mind, it is accepted according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not." (2 Cor. 8:9-12.)

3. They should be moved to give by the example of others:

"Moreover, brethren, we must inform you of the grace

of God bestowed on the churches of Macedonia; how that in a great trial of affliction the abundance of their joy and their deep poverty abounded unto the riches of their liberality. For to their power I bear record, yea, and beyond their power, they were willing of themselves; praying us with much entreaty that we would receive the contribution, and take upon us the fellowship of the ministering to the saints; and this they did, not as we hoped, but first gave their own selves to the Lord, and unto us by the will of God. Insomuch that we desired Titus, that as he had begun, so he would also finish in you the same contribution also. Therefore, as ye abound in everything, in faith, in utterance, in knowledge, in all diligence, and in your love for us, see that ye abound in this grace also. *I speak not by comandment,* but by occasion, of the forwardness of others, and to prove the sincerity of your love." (2 Cor. 8:1-8.)

"For I know the forwardness of your mind, for which I boast of you to them of Macedonia, that Achaia was ready a year ago; and your zeal hath provoked very many. Yet have I sent the brethren, lest our boasting of you should be in vain in this behalf; that, as I said, ye may be ready: lest haply if they of Macedonia come with me, and find you unprepared, we (that we say not, YE) should be ashamed in this same confident boasting. Therefore I thought it necessary to exhort the brethren, *that* they would go before unto you, and make up beforehand your bounty." (2 Cor. 9:1-7.)

4. The hope of a bountiful harvest, splendid returns, great results, should prompt us to sacrificial giving:

"Give, and it shall be given you; good measure, pressed

down, and shaken together, and running over, shall men give into your BOSOM, for with the same measure that ye mete withal it shall be measured to you again." (Luke 6:38.)

"There is that scattereth, and yet increaseth; and there is that withholdeth more than is meet, but it tendeth to poverty. The liberal soul shall be made fat; and he that watereth shall be watered also himself. (Prov. 11:24, 25.)

5. Christians should give of their means, because Christian giving honors God:

"Thou shalt remember the Lord thy God: for it is he that giveth *thee* power to get wealth." (Deut. 8:18.)

"Them that honor Me, I will honor, and they that despise Me shall be lightly esteemed." (1 Sam. 2:30.)

"Honor the Lord with thy substance, and with the first fruits of all thine increase: so shall thy barns be filled with plenty." (Prov. 3:9, 10.)

"Remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said (Lu. 6:38): It is more blessed to give than to receive." (Acts 20:35.)

"Freely ye have received, freely give." (Matt. 10:8.)

"The Lord hath ordained that they who preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel." (1 Cor. 9:14.)

6. We should give of our means to Christian work because Christian giving inures to a growth in grace.

If one is lean and unfruitful religiously, other things being equal, his barrenness might be accounted for by the stagnation of his liberality. Christian liberality is one law of Christian growth:

"But this I say: He which soweth sparingly shall reap also sparingly: and he which soweth bountifully shall

reap also bountifully. Every man according as he purposeth in his heart, SO LET HIM GIVE; not grudgingly, or of necessity; for God loveth a cheerful giver. And God is able to make all grace abound toward you; that ye, always having all sufficiency in all things, may abound to every good work; as it is written: He hath dispersed abroad, he hath given to the poor; his righteousness remaineth forever. Now he that ministereth seed to the sower, both minister bread for your food, and multiply your seed sown, and increase the fruits of your righteousness. Being enriched in every thing to all liberality, which causeth through us thanksgiving to God. For the administration of this service not only supplieth the want of the saints, but is abundant also by many thanksgivings unto God; whiles by the experiment of this ministration they glorify God for your professed subjection unto the gospel of Christ, and for your liberal distribution unto them, and unto all men; and by their prayer for you, which long after you for the exceeding grace of God in you. Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift." (2 Cor. 9:6-15.)

7. We should give of our means to support the cause of Christ, because our Lord has declared that systematic giving is a good antidote for the boll-weevil or the crop-destroyer:

"Will a man rob God? Yet ye have robbed Me. But ye say: Wherein have we robbed Thee? In tithes and offerings. Ye are cursed with a curse: for ye have robbed Me, even this whole nation. Bring ye all the tithes into the storehouse, that there may be meat in Mine house, and prove Me now HEREWITH, saith the Lord of hosts,

if I will not open you the windows of heaven and pour you out a blessing, that there shall not be room enough to receive it. And I will REBUKE THE DEVOURER FOR YOUR SAKES, and he shall not destroy the fruits of your ground, and all nations shall call you blessed." (Mal. 3:8-12.)

Christian giving for world-wide evangelism is one of our cardinal doctrines which must not be overlooked. For there can be no church perpetuity where the Gospel is not preached, and where disciples are not made and baptized, and taught to observe ALL THINGS whatsoever He hath commanded. This is a distinctive Baptist principle. Because Baptists are the only denomination which stands for the WHOLE COMMISSION, in the order given. They might be appropriately called the ALL denomination, for they are the only ecclesiastical body that gives proper emphasis to all the ALLS of the great commission. (Matt. 28:19, 20.) With loyal Baptists the commission can no more be mutilated than Christ can be mutilated with impunity. Preaching the whole Gospel to EVERY creature, making disciples of ALL nations, baptizing ALL the disciples, and teaching them to observe ALL THINGS whatsoever Christ has commanded, is a Baptist distinctive peculiarity. The *whole truth to the whole world,* is our motto. In this liberal age, when so many are inclined to treat lightly, if they do not leave out entirely, the second and third parts of the great commission, we need to throw upon this truth an added emphasis. There are professed followers of Jesus all over our land in all our churches who need to have burned into their hearts, as a profound and soul-stirring conviction, the

Apostolic doctrine of the Divine obligation of the missionary enterprise. Don't lose sight of the fact that the doctrine of a WHOLE commission to a WHOLE world is pre-eminently a Baptist distinctive doctrine. A plea for a regenerated church-membership and LOYALTY to Christ in all things, are the stars which have shone most brightly in the firmament of Baptist history. We are not at liberty to emphasize one part of the commission to the disparagement of the other. Since the days of Christ on earth, our slogan has been: The blood before baptism, and salvation before service. Just here is to be seen the Baptist peculiarity. But in our contention about the WAY it is to be done, we sometimes lose sight of the WORK to BE done. In their war over METHODS some have practically surrendered the WORK itself. In their contention for METHODS they have contracted an abhorrence for MISSIONS. Early in the past century there came into our churches a contention over missions and mission methods. It was pre-eminently a doctrinal struggle. At first the brethren said they believed in missions, but were opposed to the METHODS adopted. Later, as a natural consequence of their contention, they came to oppose MISSIONS. Thus a new doctrinal system was of necessity evolved to suit their new contention. In the minds of some the mysteries of God's sovereignty and electing grace shut out from view the obligation of the great commission. One great doctrine of the Word was allowed to obscure from their vision, and ultimately to set aside, another great doctrine of the Word, that touched the progress of Christ's kingdom at a most vital point. For nearly a quarter of a century the battle raged, but the

victory was won on the side of the great commission. The gospel of GRACE, together with the gospel of GO INTO ALL THE WORLD, won the day over the gospel of Grace without the gospel of GO. It is so today, and will ever be so. In the San Gorgonian Pass that opens the way through the high Sierras to Southern California, on either side rises a mountain peak. Each towers to its 14,000 feet and each wears its snowy crown. As the handiwork of God each vies with the other, as they reflect the glory of the morning sunlight or change into an hundred hues the mellow twilight of the closing day. Who doubts that these apparently opposing peaks rest upon the same bedrock foundation of the Sierran system? And who would hide himself at the foot of the one and lose the splendid vision of the other? So in the mountain range of God's doctrinal system there rise grand truths that pierce into the heavens beyond the stars. Here rises from the bedrock of Holy Scripture the doctrine of God's sovereign and electing grace. Yonder, from the bedrock of the same Scripture, there towers beside it the glory of a salvation we are commanded to take to ALL the world and preach to EVERY CREATURE, accompanied with the divine assurance that "whosoever WILL" may accept, RECEIVE it (Jno. 1:12), and be saved. Who is there who would seclude himself beside the mountain-peak of one of these truths and lose the peace and glory of the other? It is the duty of every loyal Baptist to bring into the clearer vision of all our churches both these high mountain-peaks of revealed truth, namely: Salvation by grace through faith, and WORLD-WIDE MISSIONS.

"I would be true, for there are those who trust me;
I would be pure, for there are those who care:
I would be strong, for there is much to suffer;
I would be brave, for there is much to dare.
I would be friend of all—the foe, the friendless;
I would be giving and forget the gift;
I would be humble, for I know my weakness;
I would look up—and laugh—and love—and lift."

CHAPTER II.

Conventions and Associations.

"Thus saith the Lord: Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the OLD PATHS, where is the good way, and walk therein. But they said: We will NOT WALK therein." (Jer. 6:16.)

From the earliest times, Baptists have had Conventions and Associations in their denominational work, very much as we have them today. As a matter of course, these Conventions and Associations have had no control whatever over the churches, nor could they have. In the very nature of the case, no outside body such as an Association or a Convention can exercise the least authority over the least Baptist church in the world. This was true of New Testament churches; it is also true of Baptist churches. In this respect New Testament and Baptist churches are identical. But as there were those in olden times who said they would not "walk in the good old ways," so it is today. In every age of the church there are to be found those who are not satisfied with the good old way, but who are spending all their energies searching out the NEW PATHS and crying down the "Old Paths."

TERMS DEFINED.

The word ASSOCIATION is from AD: to, and SOCIO: to unite together. "The act of associating, uniting, or joining together. The state of being so associated, united, or joined together. An aggregate of persons or things associated together. A society of any kind; persons in union with each other for any purpose, civil or ecclesiastical."—Universal Dictionary. The word CONVENTION is from CON: together, and VENIO: to come, to come together. "An ASSEMBLY, a meeting; an agreement, a compact. The act of coming together or assembling; the state of being assembled. Those who there meet. The act of coming together. The state of being brought together."—Universal Dictionary. So when an association meets it is a convention, and when a convention convenes it is "an aggregate of persons associated together," therefore it is an association. The association of an association which never associates is like the convention of a convention that never convenes. All this present-day talk of the Defectives about the Associations being the SERVANTS, while Conventions are the BOSSES of the churches, is a play on words unwarranted by the facts in the case. It is the demagogue's appeal to the prejudice of honest but uninformed brethren, many of whom are just a little sensitive on the money question to start with; it is clearly the plea of designing ecclesiastical politicians who have an end to serve in arraying the country brethren against the town brethren. Such a course should be condemned by every one who loves our common cause. Such appeals, as might be expected, are usually made by those

who have lost their standing as leaders in the Conventions and Associations, and justly so.

Such a course is unworthy the Christian ministry. But such men are being rapidly relegated to the rear by the sturdy, honest, conservative, Christian yeomanry of the country, and their tribe is growing gloriously smaller day by day. Why these men should spend the best of their lives in Conventions with their Boards and Corresponding Secretaries, and then suddenly find out that Boards and Secretaries and Conventions are godless and unscriptural, is a great mystery to many people. But it is not so great a mystery to those who are at all acquainted with the history of innovations. It has ever been so with a certain class of eccentrics. Such men cannot be relied on for safe leadership.

PILLARS OF ORTHODOXY.

It is claimed by the *"Landmarkers,"* as they choose to call themselves, or Gospel Missioners, that Conventionism is an innovation which seeks to usurp the rights of the churches and that, therefore, conventionism is unscriptural. But the facts show that those who are accounted the most orthodox leaders by the Landmarkers themselves were affiliated the most of their lives with the Conventions. In Pillars of Orthodoxy, a book written by Ben M. Bogard, now Editor of the Arkansas Baptist, the Organ of the Landmarkers of Arkansas, who was also the Moderator of the General Association of the United States, a short biography of seventeen of the leading men, together with a representative sermon from each, is given. According to Editor Bogard these men, above all others, are en-

titled to be called the Pillars of Orthodoxy. He says: "This book is a history, an album, and a collection of the choicest sermons and essays. It is a history of our GREAT LEADERS who have fought hard and long for BIBLE PRINCIPLES AND BIBLE DOCTRINES, and by their consecrated, and, in some instances, heroic lives, have shown themselves to be WORTHY of the title: PILLARS OF ORTHODOXY. . . . It is a pleasure to present to the public a volume containing the VERY CREAM of the best thought from the STRONGEST MEN in the Baptist denomination."—(Introduction to Pillars of Orthodoxy, pp. 9, 10.)

It will doubtless be amazing to some of our modern "Landmark" brethren to learn that these very men whom Editor Bogard declares were the "great leaders who fought hard and long for Bible Principles and Bible Doctrines," and who are the "strongest men in the Baptist Denomination," that they ALL gave the very best of their lives to the Southern Baptist Convention, or to some Convention or Association which had either the money basis or the numerical basis. Even J. N. Hall, who the last year or two of his life was a leader in the New Movement among the MODERN Landmarkers, was, even as late as 1902 and 1905, a member of the Southern Baptist Convention on the money basis. See Minutes of the Southern Baptist Convention for 1902. Is it not strange that these "great leaders in Bible principles and Bible doctrines" did not find out that Conventions were innovations among Baptists?

A. C. Dayton, author of Theodosia Earnest, affiliated with the Georgia and Tennessee Conventions on the money and

numerical basis, with their Boards and Corresponding Secretaries—the very things which Editor Bogard and a few Modern Landmarkers denounce as unscriptural and corrupt. Richard Fuller affiliated with the Maryland Convention on the money and numerical basis. William Vaughan, with the Kentucky Association on the numerical basis. A. P. Williams, than whom there was not to be found among Baptists a greater scriptorian, affiliated with the State Association of Missouri on the money basis. J. P. Boyce, one of the founders of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, many times elected President of the Southern Baptist Convention, of whom Bogard says: "Dr. Boyce was a sound Baptist, a Pillar of ORTHODOXY," affiliated with the Virginia Association on the money basis. Major W. E. Penn, one of the safest and most successful of modern evangelists, affiliated with the Texas Convention on the money basis, and with the Arkansas Baptist State Convention on the numerical basis. J. B. Moody, known by everyone as one of our greatest, if not the greatest, living Bible exegetes, affiliates with the Tennessee Convention on the numerical basis. T. T. Eaton, Editor of the Western Recorder, pastor of one of the largest Baptist churches in the South, and admittedly the greatest Baptist editor in the world, gave the very best of his life to the Kentucky Association on the numerical basis. J. R. Graves, whose orthodoxy on the fundamentals of our faith no one will have the temerity to dispute, affiliated with the Tennessee Convention and the Southern Baptist Convention on the numerical and money basis. J. B. Jeter, with the Virginia Association on the money basis. S. H. Ford, the old man eloquent, and one

of the ripest scholars amongst us, was with the Missouri Association on the money basis. J. M. Pendleton was in the organization of the Kentucky Association, which was put then and is now on the numerical basis. John A. Broadus, President of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, and considered in his day the best Greek Scholar in the world, affiliated with the Virginia and Kentucky Associations on the money and the numerical basis. J. S. Coleman, with Kentucky Association on the numerical basis. John T. Christian, one of the greatest living Baptist redactors, an author of no mean ability, has affiliated with the Kentucky Association and the Arkansas Baptist State Convention on the numerical basis. W. P. Harvey, former manager of the Baptist Book Concern, President and Manager of the Baptist World Company, affiliates with the Kentucky Association on the numerical basis. J. N. Hall, until within a few years of his death affiliated with the State Association of Kentucky on the numerical basis, and with the Southern Baptist Convention, 1902 and 1905, on the money basis. This was after the organization of the Landmark Association. (Minutes of Southern Baptist Convention for 1902, p. 48, and letter to the author from Secretary of the Southern Baptist Convention.) And Ben. M. Bogard, author of PILLARS OF ORTHODOXY and Editor of the Arkansas Baptist, the organ of the modern Landmarkers, and Moderator of the General Association, 1909, affiliated with the Arkansas Baptist State Convention, and as late as 1900 was himself a member of the Southern Baptist Convention on the MONEY basis. (See Minutes of the Southern Baptist Convention for 1900, p. 52.)

CONVENTIONISM IS NOT AN INNOVATION.

The Nebraska Convention was organized in 1868, 42 years ago, to take the place of the Domestic Mission Board. Minnesota Convention was organized in 1861, 49 years ago. Florida Convention was organized in 1854, 56 years ago. Iowa Baptist General Association was organized in 1842, 68 years ago, and the name was changed to the Iowa Baptist State Convention in 1851, 59 years ago. Arkansas, Louisiana and Texas Conventions were organized in 1848, 62 years ago. From the data we have in hand we learn that the Arkansas Baptist State Convention, as early as 1867, 43 years ago, had a Missionary Board, which was called the Arkansas Baptist State Mission Board, located at Little Rock, with nineteen members, five constituting a quorum. In 1879, 31 years ago, Rev. J. M. Hart, Eldorado, known and loved all over Arkansas, was elected President of the Convention; J. R. G. W. N. Adams was Recording Secretary, and Rev. Benjamin Thomas, D. D., Little Rock, was Corresponding Secretary. Such has been the policy of the Arkansas Baptist State Convention for years. Those who OPPOSE BOARDS and Conventions are the INNOVATORS. Ouachita College was instituted in 1886, 24 years ago, under the auspices of the Arkansas Baptist State Convention, and its policy stands unchanged to this day—1910. Those who oppose the College and the Convention have changed.

The Southern Baptist Convention was organized in 1845, 65 years ago; its policy has been practically the same from that day to this. Those who oppose it have

changed. The PILLARS OF ORTHODOXY gave the best part of their lives to the Southern Baptist Convention. Mississippi Convention was organized in 1839, 71 years ago. Indiana Convention, Missouri Association and Tennessee Convention were organized in 1833, 77 years ago. They all have their Boards and their Corresponding Secretaries. New Jersey and North Carolina Conventions were organized in 1830, 80 years ago. Pennsylvania Baptist Association was organized in 1827, 83 years ago. L. G. Beck was Corresponding Secretary for fourteen years, and raised $172,000. For the first fifty years this body averaged 29 missionaries per year. New Hampshire and Rhode Island Conventions were organized in 1826, 84 years ago. Maine Convention was organized in 1824, 86 years ago; they have Colby University. Alabama Convention, and Virginia Association, with its money basis, were organized in 1823, 87 years ago. The Baptist Association of Georgia was organized in 1822, 88 years ago; its name was changed to "Baptist Convention" in 1828. South Carolina Convention was organized in 1821, 89 years ago. Drs. Richard Furman, W. B. Johnson, Basil Manly, J. P. Boyce, John A. Broadus, were its Presidents respectively. Rev. W. H. Strickland, brother of the lamented C. W. Strickland, of Nashville, Ark., was its Corresponding Secretary. This Convention founded the Furman Theological Institute, which has grown into both the Furman University and the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. The North Carolina Baptist Society for Foreign and Domestic Missions, and the Triennial Convention, were organized in 1814, 96 years ago. The Triennial Convention merged into the American Baptist Missionary Union in 1846.

The New York Hamilton Missionary Society was organized in 1807, 103 years ago. It was changed to New York State Missionary Convention in 1821. Massachusetts Convention was organized in 1802, 108 years ago. The Baptist Missionary Society for Foreign Missions was organized in 1792, 118 years ago, at Kittering, Eng., in the house of the widow of Beeby Wallis. William Carey, a shoemaker, and Dr. Thomas, a Baptist surgeon, were appointed Missionaries by this Society in 1793. The Bodenheim Association was doing Convention work in 1789, 121 years ago: "This plan consisted in the appointment of a COMMITTEE TO EMPLOY A SUITABLE ordained Elder as a Missionary to travel into the eastern parts to preach and administer the ordinances of the Gospel. . . . It was decided to carry the Gospel not only to DESTITUTE CHURCHES, but to new and destitute settlements, where Christ was not preached."—(Missions and Mission Methods, J. H. Milburn, p. 104.) Since, according to Milburn and these modern Landmarkers, none but Church-Sent Missionaries are Scriptural Missionaries, and since, according to their lately invented methods, no Board or Committee can Scripturally "EMPLOY" a Missionary, and, since the Bodenheim Association did appoint a Board or Committee to "employ a suitable missionary to travel," etc., therefore the Bodenheim Association, according to J. H. Milburn, is clearly in the Convention column, and not with the Landmarkers; and that, too, 121 years ago. You will note also that the Bodenheim Associational Board EMPLOYED this Missionary to preach to "destitute churches" also. This is exactly what Conventions do today, and what Milburn so vigorously opposes in his Book.

The play Milburn makes on the word "ASSOCIATION" is beneath the dignity of any true author. The fact that it was called an "ASSOCIATION" by no means makes it a Landmark Association, such as Milburn and these modern Landmarkers advocate. But the "legs of the lame are not equal." Milburn has answered himself. In his book on Missions and Mission Methods, p. 123, he says: "Merely calling an organization an Association does not make it such in the Baptist time-honored sense of the term. In developing the points of dissimilarity between Baptist Associations, composed only of churches and Baptist Conventions, we shall regard and speak of those so-called State Associations in Kentucky, Virginia, Maryland and Missouri as CONVENTIONS for the ATTRIBUTES AND CHARACTERISTICS of the one are like those of the others." The Bodenheim was certainly not an Association in the "Landmark" sense of the term, for it appointed a Board or Committee, according to Milburn's own statement, to "employ a suitable missionary." The Bodenheim Association was, therefore, an Association in the "Baptist time-honored sense of the term," a regular Convention Association, with all the "attributes and characteristics" of a Convention, but not an Association in the "Landmark" sense of the term, J. H. Milburn himself being witness. The Kehukee Association was doing Convention work in 1787, 123 years ago. In Burkitt & Reed's History of the Kehukee Baptist Association, 1850, p. 92, we find the following statement: "This Association agreed to reconsider the business of ITINERANT preaching. A COMMITTEE WAS APPOINTED FOR

THAT PURPOSE, and after deliberation thereon reported as follows:

1. It is thought expedient that every quarterly meeting should be attended by some neighboring ITINERANT PREACHER.

2. That not only ORDAINED PREACHERS, but YOUNG GIFTS also be advised and called upon by the church to which they belong, to engage in the work, not ONLY amongst the churches, but in other places where it may appear necessary.

3. That as many APPOINTMENTS AS CAN be conveniently attended be BY THE PRESENT ASSOCIATION MADE, in order to begin the work."

In his effort to make it appear that the Kehukee Association was a "Landmark" Association on the question of CHURCH-SENT missionaries, J. H. Milburn, in his book on Mission Methods, p. 104, quotes only paragraph No. 2 of the foregoing quotation from Burkitt & Reed's History. Whereas, the paragraphs which he studiously left out show clearly that the Kehukee Association selected their missionaries, and even "made many appointments" for them. It was clearly a Convention Association.

The Philadelphia Association did Convention work as early as 1765, 145 years ago.

Burkitt & Reed say: "The churches thus reformed, although few in number, entered into an association compact about the year 1765, and first convened at Kehukee, from whence the Association took the name of the 'Kehukee Association.'" "This was the state of these churches until divine Providence disposed the PHILADELPHIA BAPTIST ASSOCIATION TO SEND

Messrs. Vanhorn and Miller, two of the ministers belonging to that Association, who lived in New Jersey, TO TRAVEL INTO THE SOUTHERN COLONIES and VISIT THE CHURCHES and preach the Gospel."—History, pp. 36, 33. The Philadelphia Association was organized in 1707. These men were not sent out DIRECT from the churches as the Gospel Missionaries or Landmarkers demand, but "divine Providence disposed the Philadelphia Baptist Association to SEND" them to travel into the Southern Colonies. Is that Gospel Missions? A clear case of Conventionism, 145 years ago. The Philadelphia Association was the oldest Association in the United States. The Charleston, organized in 1751, was the next. The Charleston Association was doing Convention work in 1755. Of this Benedict, Vol. 2, p. 135, says:

"In 1755 the Association, taking into consideration the destitute condition of many places in the interior settlements of this and the neighboring States (then provinces), recommended to the churches to make contributions for the support of a missionary to itinerate in those parts. Mr. Hart *was authorized* and requested, provided a sufficient sum should be raised, *to procure,* if possible, a suitable person for the purpose. With this view he visited Pennsylvania and New Jersey in the following year, and *prevailed with Rev. John Gano* (this was the Gano who baptized George Washington.—Ed.) to undertake the service, who attended the annual meeting, and was cordially received." This was a straight case of Conventionism. The Association appointed a Board of ONE to procure a missionary, and asked the churches to support him. No Gospel Missions in that. That was 155 years ago. This

Association began a school among the Indians, the very thing Convention Baptists are doing today, and the very thing to which our Landmark brethren so vehemently object. Benedict says:

"Rev. John Rooker was engaged to preach to the Catawba Indians, at least once a month, and to consult the chiefs and other persons of influence on their disposition to have a school founded among them. Mr. Rooker at the next meeting reported that the Indians had given him a very favorable reception, etc. It was, in consequence, determined to continue the mission, and Mr. Rooker was *authorized to employ a teacher to instruct the youth in the common branches of education,* and the principles of Christianity." (Vol. 2, p. 146.) Speaking again of this Association's work among the Indians, Benedict further says: "In 1810 this society had collected by annual contributions $1,896.60, of which $1,850.78 had been expended in paying the *salaries of their missionary* and *schoolmaster, purchasing books,* etc." (Vol. 2, 441.) One hundred years ago the second Association organized in the United States was doing the very things to which our Landmark brethren so seriously object today. They furnished the Indians a missionary, free schools, school books, etc. These Associations were clearly within the Convention column, 100 years ago.

English Baptists were doing work much like the work now being done by our Home Mission Board at Atlanta, Ga., in 1723, 187 years ago. They were doing Board work just as Convention Baptists do today. Of this work Mr. Cramp says:

"The ministers living in London and its vicinity formed

themselves into a society, January 20, 1723-4, which has continued until now. The original purposes of the society are thus adverted to by Mr. Ivimey: 'They gave their opinion and advice in any matters of difficulty in the churches that were referred to them by both parties; they received APPLICATIONS from the country ministers to assist them from the Baptist Fund; they sanctioned and recommended cases of building and repairing meeting houses in the country, and to be collected for in London; they watched rigorously over the purity of the members composing the BOARD, whether it related to charges of immoral conduct, or of erroneous principles; they received to their friendship ministers upon their being settled as pastors in the churches, and young ministers who were introduced by the pastors of the respective churches which had called them to the ministry; and they appear to have generally acted in a BODY in assisting DESTITUTE churches, and at the ordination of ministers—to have very strictly discouraged separation in the churches—and to have affectionately supported each other against traducers.' The society is now called the Baptist Board."—Baptist History, p. 488.

This Board helped in building and repairing churches, and supplemented the salaries of ministers in weak churches who applied for help. This was conventionism pure and simple, 187 years ago.

The General Assembly, or Convention of England was organized in 1689, 221 years ago. Of these General Assemblies Benedict says:

"These were composed of representatives from the VARIOUS ASSOCIATIONS, and from such churches

as chose to send their deputies, which might be either ministers or private brethren."—Benedict, His. Baptists, p. 332.

This proves that Baptist Conventions 221 years ago were not composed of CHURCHES, as our Landmark brethren teach, but of "representatives from various associations," as well as "from such churches as chose to send their deputies." Of these General Assemblies or Conventions, Benedict further says:

"In process of time, so strongly were many inclined to constitute these bodies into courts of appeal that it was found necessary to define their powers, and make them advisory councils, as Baptists in ALL AGES and countries have done."—History, p. 332.

Notwithstanding, these general bodies could not rightfully exercise any authority over the churches, then as now, yet they deemed it not inconsistent, then as now, to have their Corresponding Secretaries or Superintendents of Missions, whose duty it was, then as now, to help the churches in every way consistent with their independency. These Superintendents they called MESSENGERS, perhaps from the names given to them in the Scriptures. (2 Cor. 8:23.) If these Superintendents sometimes transcended their prerogatives, *that* did not prove the unscripturalness of their work, any more than the usurpation of authority by Pastors, Deacons, or Sunday School Superintendents, proves the unscripturalness of their positions. Of these helpers Benedict says:

"They therefore introduced an officer into their system, whom they styled a MESSENGER. He was generally chosen by an ASSOCIATION of the representatives of

the churches. They were appointed for the gathering of churches, and the establishment of them. But when churches increased, and errors and irregularities sprung up among the young converts and inexperienced ministers, it was judged expedient to extend the MESSENGER'S work, by assigning to him the superintendence and, IN A SENSE, the government of those CHURCHES which united in calling him to the office." (Benedict, p. 333.)

Of course, the ABUSE of such an office might lead to Episcopacy, just as the practice of injecting Church Authority into the General Association, and other general bodies, by the Landmarkers might lead to the Papacy. But no one would deny the right of a church to instruct messengers to general bodies, simply because such a course when abused leads to centralization and ecclesiastical courts. Benedict has this further to say about the General Assembly or Convention of England:

"The year 1689 was a distinguished epoch in the history of the English Baptists, on account of the General Assembly which then convened in London and published a confession of faith which was long a standard work among them. This Assembly was composed of delegates from upwards of a hundred congregations, from different parts of England and Wales." (History, p. 336.)

We have shown already from Benedict, p. 332, that these conventions were also composed of "representatives from the various Associations." Of this Convention J. H. Milburn says:

"The Assembly which adopted the 'London Confession of Faith' was UNDOUBTEDLY A REPRESENTATIVE BODY AND CORRECTLY REPRESENTED THE

FAITH AND PRACTICE OF BAPTIST CHURCHES AT THAT TIME." . . . *"We now quote from Benedict's History* of Baptists respecting this meeting as follows: 'At this meeting of MESSENGERS of the churches which adopted the London confession was, Resolved among other things to raise a fund for missionary purposes and to assist feeble churches, also for the purpose of ministerial education.'" (Missions and Mission Methods, p. 106.)

Then, after GARBLING and LITERALLY CHANGING the WORDS of Benedict, in the above quotation, as we will show presently, Milburn exclaims and soliloquizes vociferously as follows:

"Those churches were then evidently Gospel Mission Churches. This was 125 years before there was a Baptist Convention on earth. Honestly, reader, what do you think of those editors and authors (?) who persistently assert that those who refuse to adopt Conventionism have 'split off,' but will never tell what they have 'split off' from? There were no Baptist Conventions, nor Convention Baptists, nor churches co-operating with organizations of similar character or kind, for over 1,700 years." (Idem., p. 107.)

Thus we have Milburn's unqualified statement that the Baptist General Assembly of England, 1689, composed of representatives from ASSOCIATIONS and Churches, was "undoubtedly a representative body and correctly represented the faith and practice of Baptist churches of that time." Then to leave the impression on his readers that this Assembly was NOT a Convention, but a Landmark Association, and that "this was 125 years before there

was a Baptist Convention on earth," he quotes Benedict as saying:

"At this meeting of MESSENGERS of the churches which adopted the London Confession was, Resolved among other things to raise a fund for missionary purposes and to assist feeble churches, also for the purpose of ministerial education." (Mission Methods, p. 106.)

But when we turn to Benedict's History, cited by Milburn, lo, and behold to our utter astonishment, we find that THIS was what Benedict wrote:

"AT THIS CONVENTION the DENOMINATION, among other things, resolved to raise a fund for missionary purposes, and to ASSIST FEEBLE CHURCHES; also, for the purpose of ministerial education.—Rippon's Register for 1796." (Benedict's History, p. 336.)

De omnibus rebus, et quibusdam aliis—about everything, and something more besides! Compare what Benedict really SAID with what J. H. Milburn SAYS Benedict said, and we think that you will agree with us that the English language is entirely inadequate to properly express our contempt for such garbling and misrepresentation of authors to carry a point. To use Milburn's own language: "Honestly, reader, what do you think of those editors and authors (?) who persistently assert that there were no Baptist Conventions, nor Convention Baptists," in 1689, and then to prove their false assumption deliberately erase what the Historian says, and insert words of their own choosing. The Convention of 1689 voted to raise a fund, not only for missionary purposes, but also for *ministerial education,* and to help *FEEBLE CHURCHES.* In this respect they were exactly like Con-

ventions of the present day, and exactly UNLIKE modern Landmark associations. Yes, Baptists were doing Convention work 221 years ago. Milburn's own author so declares. The Welsh Association was doing convention work in 1653, 257 years ago. They did just what our Conventions and Associations are doing today. J. Davis, in his History of The Welsh Baptists, 1835, says:

"In the Association held at Swansea in 1654, the church at Llantrisaint proposed to assist the church at Abergavenny, now Llanwenarth, to support their minister, which also they did. From the MESSENGERS of Llantrisaint, also, the proposal to revive the ancient order of things, came the preceding year; that is, to encourage and support the missionary cause. *Let our brethren in the new world,* look and stare at this, especially our anti-missionary friends. Be it known unto them, that in the years 1653, IN THE WELSH ASSOCIATION held at Abergavenny, county of Monmouth, South Wales, COLLECTIONS WERE MADE, when the Welsh church SUBSCRIBED to raise a fund for MISSIONARY PURPOSES. Their plan was for the MESSENGERS of every church to mention a CERTAIN SUM, and BIND themselves to bring that SUM with them to the next ASSOCIATION. For instance, Swansea, 5 lbs.; Llantrisaint, 2 lbs. 10s; Carmathen, 2 lbs. 10s. No one was compelled to give anything, neither was any messenger ever blamed for making such engagements, but was cheerfully assisted by his brethren to fulfill them. This is only a specimen of the commencement of the missionary cause in this region. The next year, we find that the churches had more than

doubled that sum." (History of The Welsh Baptists, p. 85.)

The same Author, page 187, says: "The first Association AFTER the reformation, as far as we can find, was held at Abergavenny, on the 14th and 15th days of the sixth month, in the YEAR 1653; when the MINISTERS AND MESSENGERS of five of the old and apostolic Baptist order, met and calmly and DELIBERATELY CONSIDERED THE BEST MEANS TO BE ADOPTED FOR THE FURTHERANCE OF THE GOSPEL OF CHRIST." This Association, composed of "ministers and Messengers," was "deliberately considering the best means to be adopted for the furtherance of the gospel of Christ," but no one thought of charging them with usurping the authority or rights of the churches. Their method was exactly like our Conventions, and exactly UNLIKE the demands and teachings of modern "Landmark" Baptists, who claim that the "best means to be adopted for the furtherance of the gospel of Christ" is to be left entirely to the consideration of the local CHURCHES, as such, and not to the "ministers and messengers of the old and apostolic Baptist order," as it was in the case of the Welsh Association in 1653. This Welsh Association was clearly a Convention Association, doing Convention work 257 years ago. Thus it appears that this new movement to restore the ancient order of things as respects the missionary enterprise in the seventeenth century began, not in the LOCAL CHURCH as such, but IN THE ASSOCIATION, among the MINISTERS AND MESSENGERS. This was Conventionism, pure and simple. The Waldenses and Albigenses, the Baptists of the twelfth century, had

their Associations and Conventions, much like the Associations and Conventions among Convention Baptists of today; but wholly UNLIKE modern Landmark associations which inject church authority into their general bodies. Orchard, in his History of Foreign Baptists, page 195, says:

"By the assiduous and unceasing efforts of the ELDERS AND TEACHERS, to instruct and qualify every member of the community, to inform the ignorant of the way of salvation; and by their SYSTEM of local itinerancy, while others undertook more extensive journeys. These UNITED EFFORTS OF THE WHOLE BODY were attended with incalculable good, and such ORGANIZED EXERTIONS promised fair to EVANGELIZE THE WORLD; and if this object is ever attained, SIMILAR MEANS must be used by men of disinterested virtue, whose love of souls shall rise SUPERIOR TO THE LOVE OF GAIN AND EASE. From their COMBINED endeavors to promote the knowledge of Christ, 'The sects of the Cathraists, Waldenses, Petrobrussians, and others,' says Mosheim, 'gathered strength from day to day, spread imperceptibly throughout all Europe, and assembled numerous congregations in Italy, France, Spain, and Germany.'"

This was in 1183, 727 years ago. Thus, as early as 727 years ago, our Baptist fathers, of whom the world was not worthy, had "their system of local itinerancy," sending their "Elders and Teachers," in "united efforts of the whole BODY," with "organized exertions to EVANGELIZE THE WORLD."

The churches were aroused to their obligation of WORLD-WIDE EVANGELISM, "by the assiduous and unceasing

efforts of the Elders and Teachers." It is just so today. And this is Conventionism, no more, no less. Like the Conventions of today, these general Baptist BODIES of the twelfth century made "organized exertions to evangelize the WORLD," the very thing modern Landmark Baptists so vehemently oppose. The Waldenses were without doubt Convention Baptists. Our Baptist Fathers used "organized exertions" and "united efforts" to "evangelize the world" in those days; and with Orchard we believe that "if this object is ever attained, SIMILAR MEANS must be used by men of disinterested VIRTUE, whose love of souls shall rise superior to the *love of GAIN and EASE";* base principles so often appealed to by those who oppose Conventions and Missionary Societies.

According to Davis, the Historian, the Welsh Baptists had *their* Associations which "met and calmly and deliberately considered the best means to be adopted for the furtherance of the gospel of Christ," more than 1310 years ago. He says: "We have every reason to believe that the Welsh Baptists had their ASSOCIATIONS, and that Dyfrig, Illyd, Dynawt, were the leading men among them, long before Austin's attempt to convert them to Popery, IN THAT ASSOCIATION, which was held on the borders of England, about the year 600." (Davis History Welsh Baptists, p. 187.) All these Associations were, according to Davis the Historian, just such as our Convention Associations are today. In 249, 1661 years ago, Baptists had their Associations and Conventions, "mutual UNIONS for the MANAGEMENT of spiritual affairs." Orchard says:

"Associations of ministers and churches, which at first

were formed in Greece became common throughout the empire. These *mutual* UNIONS for the management of spiritual affairs, led to the choice of a PRESIDENT, which added distinction amongst ministers." (History of Foreign Baptists, p. 29.)

If the abuse of Conventions in those degenerating times is sufficient reason for the abrogation of Conventions NOW, the same reasons may be assigned for the abolition of Associations NOW; for, if these authorities are to be relied upon, the Associations of those times operated upon the very principles governing the Conventions of our present day.

But the opponents to Conventions sometimes cite the language of Orchard's in respect to the missionary operations of the Paulicians of the eleventh century in justification of their fight on Conventions and societies.

Orchard says: "An evident mark of apostolic spirit possessed by this people must be admitted by all; WITHOUT ANY FUNDS or PUBLIC SOCIETIES to countenance or support the arduous undertaking, *otherwise than their respective churches,* the Paulicians fearlessly penetrated the most barbarous parts of Europe, and went SINGLE-HANDED, and single-eyed, to the conflict with every grade of character." (History, p. 139.) After quoting the foregoing from Orchard, J. H. Milburn, in Missions and Mission Methods, p. 109, comments as follows:

"Here the historian positively asserts that those Paulician Baptists had NO SOCIETIES to countenance or support their 'arduous undertaking,' but went to the conflict against every grade of character with NOTHING TO

SUPPORT them 'otherwise than their respective churches.'"

If the methods used by these earnest Paulicians before the invention of printing is to be our EXAMPLE, as Milburn insists, then the Landmarkers should, without delay, dissolve their publication society, and put an end to their Landmark literature, and disband the Arkansas Baptist Publishing Company, and dismiss their Missionary Committee of thirty members, and throw away their mission fund, for "WITHOUT FUNDS or PUBLIC SOCIETIES to support the arduous undertaking," the Paulicians "fearlessly penetrated to the most barbarous parts of Europe, SINGLE-HANDED." If that quotation is against CONVENTIONS, it is also against all sorts of missionary funds and missionary societies, and missionary organizations. Milburn, the spokesman for the Landmarkers, has put his brethren clearly WITHOUT the pale of Missionary Baptists. And this is the logical outcome of their defection. It is the battle of 1832 fought over again, Milburn himself being witness. Baptist people had their Conventions in 170 A. D., 1,740 years ago. Orchard, History of Foreign Baptists, pp. 109-110, says:

"When points were difficult or disputed, a more general company of MINISTERS and DISCIPLES MET, AS THE APOSTLES HAD DONE AT JERUSALEM, to consult and promote love, truth and unity. This course probably suggested to churches the propriety of a regular intercourse with one another. A stated meeting ensued of all the churches in the same canton or province, wherein they fully discussed church affairs. From the confidence the church had in their ministers, when the DISTANCE

was great, the affairs of the churches were intrusted to a deputation of ELDERS AND DEACONS WITH OTHERS. From these friendly meetings arose a sort of REPUBLIC ASSOCIATION of the churches in a particular province. The metropolis being the most centric, was usually the PLACE OF MEETING. At first, the office of PRESIDENT seems generally to have been elective, and to have continued no longer than the sessions of the synod. The BISHOP of the place where the ASSOCIATION was held, from a sort of a natural title to PRESIDE IN THE CONVENTION, came, by the gradual but sure operation of custom, to be regarded as the head of the BODY. This in TIME, aided by OTHER AUXILIARY CAUSES, established a metropolitan bishop, which when fully matured, gave a SEAT and conferred AUTHORITY on the papistical monster. During the greater part of this century, Christian churches were INDEPENDENT of each other; nor were they joined together BY ASSOCIATION, CONFEDERACY, OR ANY OTHER BONDS but those of CHARITY. Each Christian assembly was a little state, governed by its own laws, which were either enacted, or at least approved, by the society; but in process of time, as above noticed, ALL THE CHURCHES OF A PROVINCE WERE BROUGHT INTO ONE ECCLESIASTICAL BODY." From this long quotation, the historian clearly shows that the churches of the second century, more than 1,740 years ago, had their Associations and Conventions which were composed of "deputations of Elders and deacons with others," similar to the first CONVENTION at Jerusalem, A. D. 52, Acts 15th chapter. Just as our Conventions today are

composed of INDIVIDUALS, and not composed of CHURCHES. But in process of time, when they left the Apostolic standard or method of co-operation by MESSENGERS, when they began to inject CHURCH AUTHORITY into their Associations and Conventions, when "all the churches of a province were brought into one ecclesiastical body," the very moment they gave church authority to their Associations and Conventions as the modern Landmarkers do who declare that their Associations are composed of CHURCHES, and not of MESSENGERS; that very moment, and by that very ACT, as Orchard says, they "gave a seat and conferred authority on the papistical monster." CHURCH AUTHORITY in our Associations and Conventions, which is the slogan today of our "Landmark" brethren, one of their cardinal doctrines, was one of the prime causes of the Papacy in the dark ages with all her death-dealing influences. The Apostolic churches, and the churches of the first and second century, as Orchard says, were not "joined together by ASSOCIATION, CONFEDERACY, OR ANY OTHER BONDS, but those of charity." And regular Baptist churches of today are not "joined together by ASSOCIATION, CONFEDERACY, OR ANY OTHER BONDS but those of charity." And that, too, for the very best of reasons—it is IMPOSSIBLE. Scriptural Associations and Scriptural Conventions are not, and in the very nature of the case cannot be, composed of CHURCHES. No church can Scripturally delegate her authority to any other organization. She may use other organizations as a means of carrying out the will of Christ, such as Conventions and Associations, and Publication societies. But "Landmark"

Associations are declared to be composed of churches, hence "Landmark" Associations are ECCLESIASTICAL bodies. Such Associations are unscriptural in that respect, because it is unscriptural for a Church of Jesus Christ to DELEGATE her authority. (Matt. 18:15-17.)

The churches cannot be "JOINED by an Association, Confederacy, or any other BONDS," in the sense of an ORGANIZATION. Before the Churches can merge into and compose an Association or a Convention they must necessarily surrender their Independency which is and has ever been the BULWARK of Baptist churches. Churches may CO-OPERATE in the work of an association or a convention, but conventions and associations are not thereby composed of churches. Scriptural churches may CO-OPERATE in the work of the Anti-saloon League, but the Anti-saloon League is not thereby composed of CHURCHES. Churches may, and should, co-operate in the work of our missionary societies, but our missionary societies are not thereby composed of churches.

But if the Defectives insist that the Apostolic churches had no associations or conventions in New Testament times, then it follows that the "Landmarkers" should have no associations NOW. This is the logic of their position on mission METHODS. Our Baptist Fathers, according to Orchard, had their Conventions and Associations which were composed of "Elders and Deacons with others," as early as 170 A. D., 1,740 years ago. Convention Baptists, therefore, are clearly in LINE with the Baptists of the SECOND century.

But are CONVENTIONS and BOARDS Scriptural? Did the Apostles use such means in the propagation of the

Gospel in the early churches? We think we are able to show conclusively that as early as A. D. 60, 1,850 years ago, Baptists had their BOARDS and Conventions just as we have them today. Regular Missionary Baptists have employed these means in missionary work for at least 1,850 years, therefore THEY ALONE have the right to be considered Primitive Baptists on these points. We take the liberty of transcribing the following pointed arguments in favor of Conventions and Boards from Chapter VII, Christian Union, Or The Problem Solved, by Ben M. Bogard, Editor of the Arkansas Baptist—the organ of the Landmark Baptists of Arkansas, Moderator of the General Association of Landmark Baptists, 1909, Editor of some of the Landmark Sunday School literature, and of whom J. H. Milburn, in his book on Missions and Mission Methods, p. 111, says:

"We wish to acknowledge some very valuable help we received from Brother Ben. M. Bogard, who collected for us some of the historical data in this book. Brother Bogard is Editor of the Arkansas Baptist, published at Little Rock, Arkansas; he is a fine scholar, an able Editor, a fine historian, a most excellent preacher and is doubtless the ablest oral controversialist in the United States." Bogard ought to be good authority for the "Landmarkers." Editor Bogard says:

"WHO ARE THE PRIMITIVE BAPTISTS? Before the year 1832 the Baptists believed and practiced the same things. At that time (1832) they divided on the following questions: Missions, salary to preachers, BOARDS, CONVENTIONS, schools and colleges, etc. Previous to this all were one, and such a question, as who

were the Primitive Baptists, was never asked, because they were all Primitive. Whatever was practiced and believed before the year 1832 by the Baptists was the practice and belief of Primitive Baptists. Those Baptists who do not teach the doctrines which Baptists taught before the year 1832 are not Primitive Baptists. Let us examine history, both sacred and profane, and see who are primitive in practice and thus we will see who are Primitive Baptists. All historians of note agree that Baptists had their origin with Christ and the Apostles. Then, if this is true, that which was PRACTICED by the EARLY disciples can be called Primitive Baptist practice. Let us first, therefore, examine the New Testament and see what doctrines and practices prevailed at that time. . . . Another cause of the division was the fact that Baptists *had Mission Boards, Conventions, Sunday schools,* etc. Let us see who are Primitive Baptists on THIS POINT. If Baptists in New Testament times had BODIES which will correspond with MODERN Conventions, BOARDS, Sunday schools, etc., then those Baptists who have them NOW are Primitive Baptists on that point. Read Gal. 2:1-2: 'Then fourteen years after I went up to Jerusalem with Barnabas, and took Titus with me also. And I went up by revelation, and communicated unto them that Gospel which I preached among the Gentiles, but privately to them which were of reputation, lest by any means I should run, or had run, in vain.'"

"Here we see Paul called a number of brethren together for the purpose of considering important matters—especially his mission among the Gentiles. 'The brethren thus called together were men of reputation, noted for their

wisdom. These with Paul and Barnabas, and probably Titus, made up the meeting, and they were consulting, NOT AS A CHURCH, but as INDIVIDUAL Baptists, about the preaching of the Gospel and for the purpose of deciding an important matter. Paul gives us the result of the conference thus: "When James and Cephas, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship; that we should go unto the Heathen and they unto the Circumcision. Only they would that we should remember the poor," etc. (Gal. 2:9-11.)

"Here was a Baptist meeting considering missionary and benevolent work. Of course, we know but little of what was said. We know, however, that they formed a partnership to carry on preaching among the Jews and Gentiles, and that it was agreed to get up funds for the poor. If these brethren thus met and thus agreed, OUTSIDE OF THEIR CHURCH CAPACITY, brethren certainly may pursue a similar course NOW. And if so they may have set TIMES and set RULES for such conferences, and this would be the SAME THING as a missionary CONVENTION or society. Missionary Baptists have meetings of this sort. Therefore, as to this, they are Primitive Baptists. Hardshells do not have meetings of this sort, nor will they fellowship those who do have them. Therefore, the Hardshells are not the Primitive Baptists—at least as to THIS POINT.'" (Quoted approvingly by Bogard from Throgmorton-Potter Debate, pp. 53-54.)

But Bogard continues:

"As to BOARDS, it is necessary to define a BOARD. A board is a BODY of men, usually, two, three, or a half-

dozen, who are APPOINTED by the churches for special work. Read 2 Cor. 8:18-19: And we have sent with him the brother, whose praise is in the gospel throughout all the churches; and not that only, but who was also chosen of the churches to TRAVEL WITH US with this grace (gift in margin) which is ADMINISTERED BY US to the glory of the same Lord, and declaration of your ready mind. Here is a man chosen by the churches to travel and RAISE MONEY for a benevolent object. Read all of the 8th chapter of 2 Corinthians. To have APPOINTED this man it was necessary for the churches to have come together AS AN ASSOCIATION, WHICH IS THE SAME THING AS A CONVENTION, for he was chosen NOT BY A CHURCH, but by the CHURCHES (2 Cor. 8:19). This could have been done in no way except through MESSENGERS of the churches ASSEMBLED IN A CONVENTION. Indeed, Paul says, if any inquire as to the authority of this BOARD that was SENT to them to RAISE MONEY, that it was done by MESSENGERS OF THE CHURCHES." (Read 2 Cor. 8:23.)

"So it does seem that the New Testament SETTLES the question of Missions, Salaries to Preachers, CONVENTIONS, BOARDS, etc. THESE were the PRINCIPAL causes of the DIVISION. Now who are the Primitive Baptists from a Bible standpoint? There is but ONE answer: THOSE WHO TEACH AND PRACTICE THOSE THINGS TAUGHT AND PRACTICED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. THE HARDSHELLS DO NOT PRACTICE THOSE THINGS, THEREFORE, THEY ARE NOT PRIMITIVE BAPTISTS. THE MISSIONARY BAPTISTS DO PRACTICE THOSE

THINGS, THEREFORE, THEY ARE THE PRIMITIVE BAPTISTS." (Christian Union, or The Problem Solved, by Ben. M. Bogard, pp. 56, 61, 62, 63, 64.)

We have shown that regular Missionary Baptists have employed Boards and Conventions even from Apostolic times, as early as A. D. 60, to the present time, A. D. 1910, or 1,850 years. Then, "who are the Primitive Baptists from a Bible standpoint?" On page 65, same book, Ben. M. Bogard says: "LONG before 1832 Baptists were missionaries, according to the best records. Whatever took place among them BEFORE the Division (1832) was PRIMITIVE Baptist Practice."

But before the DIVISION in 1832, according to Bogard, "the Baptists believed and practiced the same things." They had Conventions and Boards, just as Convention Baptists have today; therefore, the Convention Baptists of today are, according to Editor Bogard, the Primitive Baptists. Hardshells and modern Landmark Baptists do "not practice those things, therefore, they are not Primitive Baptists." (Idem, p. 64.) The opponents to Conventions and Boards answer themselves: "So it does seem that the New Testament SETTLES the question of Missions, Salaries to Preachers, CONVENTIONS, BOARDS, etc. THESE were the PRINCIPAL CAUSES of the DIVISION. Now who are the Primitive Baptists from a Bible standpoint? There is but ONE answer: THOSE WHO TEACH AND PRACTICE THOSE THINGS TAUGHT AND PRACTICED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. The Hardshells do NOT practice those things, therefore, THEY are NOT Primitive Baptists. The Missionary Baptists DO practice those things, therefore, THEY ARE the Primi-

tive Baptists." (Christian Union, by Ben. M. Bogard, p. 64.)

On this argument of Editor Bogard's we submit the following unanswerable syllogisms:

1. Those who teach and practice those things taught and practiced in the New Testament, namely, CONVENTIONS and BOARDS, are the Primitive Baptists.

2. Present-day Convention Baptists teach and practice those things taught and practiced in the New Testament, namely, CONVENTIONS and BOARDS;

3. Therefore, present-day Convention Baptists are the Primitive Baptists, Bogard himself being witness.

1. Those who do NOT teach and practice those things taught and practiced in the New Testament, namely, CONVENTIONS and BOARDS, are NOT Primitive Baptists.

2. But the Hardshells do NOT teach and practice those things taught and practiced in the New Testament, namely, CONVENTIONS and BOARDS;

3. Therefore, the Hardshells are NOT the Primitive Baptists, Bogard himself being witness.

1. Those who do NOT teach and practice those things taught and practiced in the New Testament, namely, CONVENTIONS and BOARDS, are NOT the Primitive Baptists.

2. But the Gospel Missioners do NOT teach and practice those things taught and practiced in the New Testament, namely, CONVENTIONS and BOARDS;

3. Therefore, the Gospel Missioners are not the Primitive Baptists, Bogard himself being witness.

1. Those who do NOT teach and practice those things taught and practiced in the New Testament, namely, CON-

VENTIONS and BOARDS, are NOT the Primitive Baptists.

2. But the Landmarkers do NOT teach and practice those things taught and practiced in the New Testament, namely, CONVENTIONS and BOARDS;

3. Therefore, the Landmarkers are NOT the Primitive Baptists, Bogard himself being witness.

CHAPTER III.

Landmarkism and Innovation.

If CONVENTIONS and BOARDS were employed and maintained in the execution of mission work until the DIVISION in 1832, as Editor Bogard declares, then it follows as a matter of course, that those who have discarded Conventions and Boards are the SECEDING parties, the INNOVATORS, on the question of Mission Methods. Editor Bogard, who is NOW one of the leaders in the Landmark secession, in his book on Christian Union, p. 56, says: "Before the year 1832 the Baptists believed and practiced the SAME things. At THAT TIME (1832) they DIVIDED on the following questions: Missions, salary to preachers, BOARDS, CONVENTIONS, schools and colleges. Previous to THIS all were ONE." Then on p. 64, Bogard declares that the "New Testament SETTLES the question of Missions, Salaries to Preachers, CONVENTIONS, BOARDS, etc. These were the PRINCIPAL CAUSES of the division." Now the Hardshells discarded these Conventions and Boards, and, therefore, according to Editor Bogard, they "are NOT Primitive Baptists."

It is an indisputable fact, which no reputable historian will deny, that the Hardshells began their SECESSION from the regular Missionary Baptists by a fight on Mis-

sionary Boards and Conventions. These were the very arguments made by John Taylor, one of the most influential writers in the Hardshell deflection, in his Pamphlet, "Thoughts," etc., written October 27, 1819.

Taylor says: "The deadly evil I have in view is under the epithets or appellations of Missionary Boards, Conventions, Societies, and Theological Schools, all bearing the appearance of great though affected sanctity, as the mystery of iniquity did in the days of Paul, when the man of sin was in embryo." (Gen. of Anti-Missionism, Carroll, p. 97.)

Under the leadership of such eccentric enthusiasts some of the churches began to "come out from" the regular Baptist churches, who, according to Bogard, had used Conventions and Boards even from the time of the Apostles. In September, 1835, the Chemung Association (New York and Pennsylvania) at a meeting with Sullivan Church, Charleston, Tioga County, Pa., passed the following: "Whereas, a number of the Associations with whom we have held correspondence have departed from the simplicity of the doctrine and practice of Christ, and have followed cunningly devised fables (the inventions of men), uniting themselves with the world in what are falsely called *benevolent societies,* founded upon a *moneyed basis,* with a profession to spread the gospel, which is another gospel differing from the gospel of Christ. Resolved, therefore, That we discontinue our correspondence with the Philadelphia, Abington, Bridgewater, Franklin, Steuben, Madison, and all other Associations, which are supporting the popular institutions of the day; and most affectionately invite all those churches, or MEMBERS of churches, who

cannot fellowship them to COME OUT FROM AMONG them and LEAVE them." (Bap. Ency., Cathcart, p. 77.)

Taylor says they *Came out from them and* LEFT them because of Boards and Conventions, etc. Daniel Parker, another recognized leader of the Hardshell secession, claims to have been the first man in those days to make WAR on Conventions and Boards, which Bogard says had been taught and practiced by ALL Baptists until 1832. Like the Defectives of the present day, Parker at the first made war on the mission PLANS, and not on Missions per se. They logically, of course, drifted into open oppositions to MISSIONS, as well as to mission Methods. And some have prophesied the same results in the modern Landmark secession of 1902. And it must be admitted that some of their leaders are headed that way in this year of our Lord, 1910. But if Parker spoke the first word in opposition to Boards and Conventions, then it follows that the fight on these institutions was a brand new innovation. But here are his own words: "It is evident that great talents have been engaged and much time and money spent to vindicate the MISSION PLAN, and as YET BUT LITTLE SAID OR DONE AGAINST IT. It makes me shudder when I think I am the FIRST ONE (that I have any knowledge of) among the THOUSANDS of zealous religions of America that have ventured to draw the sword against the ERROR, or to shoot at it and to spare no arrows." (Gen. of Anti-M., p. 108.) If Parker was the FIRST "to shoot at" Conventionism and Boardism, certainly Anti-conventionism and Anti-boardism was, in Parker's day, a brand new thing. In fact, Editor Bogard says the New Testament settles the question of Boards and Con-

ventions, and that ALL BAPTISTS practiced these things until the Hardshell defection under Taylor, Parker et al., in 1832. Alexander Campbell, the Founder of the Campbellite Church, also took part in this war on Conventions and Boards, and added much to the strength of the Hardshell innovation. Campbell, Taylor, and Parker, of course, claimed, just as the modern Landmarkers claim, that Conventions and Boards were UNSCRIPTURAL, and that the Baptists were wrong in the use of these means, even if they had been in use, as Bogard declares, from the days of the Apostles. But in those days, as it is in these days, their strongest arguments consisted in bold assertions and ridicule, claiming, of course, that the ANTI-Board party was on New Testament ground. This claim had weight with those honest people who wanted to be Scriptural, but who did not know, as Editor Bogard declares, that ALL BAPTISTS had been using Boards and Conventions since the days of the Apostles. Hardshellism or Anti-conventionism, therefore, if we reckon from its earliest advocates in America, is less than one hundred years old. If we reckon from the time they first began to organize Anti-convention churches, it is not more than EIGHTY years old.

No reputable historian will deny that the Hardshells left the Regular Missionary Baptists in 1832, just as the "Landmarkers" have left the Regular Missionary Baptists within the past few years. Of this Hardshell rupture in 1832 Spencer quotes the Minutes of the General Association of Kentucky, 1837, p. 11, as saying:

"The Anti-missionary spirit owes its origin to the notorious Daniel Parker. He was the first person, called a Baptist, that lent a hand to the Infidel and Papist in op-

posing the proclamation of the gospel to every creature, and the translation and circulation of the Scriptures in all languages and among all people." (Hist. Ky. Baptists, Vol. I., p. 658.)

This was only five years after their separation from the Missionaries. In the same year, 1837, Eld. Gilbert Beebe, Editor Signs of The Times, the first Hardshell paper in existence, established in 1832, used the following language concerning the Hardshell separation:

"After the missionary frenzy had broken out among the Baptists, etc., those who had remained steadfast in the apostle's doctrine, etc., published a circular to all old-fashioned Baptists in the United States, to convene with the Baptist Church at Black Rock, Md., to take into consideration the trying state of Zion, etc., in opposition to the new schemes and inventions of the day, etc. And having met, a free interchange of sentiment was obtained, which happily resulted in a unanimous resolution to stand fast in the LIBERTY wherewith Christ has made us free, and not to be entangled with the yoke of bondage which was then being applied to the NECKS of thousands who had ONCE RANKED with Regular Baptists.

"On that occasion it was, upon mature deliberation, thought advisable that we who could not fellowship the NEW doctrines which had gained among those of our profession, or their newly invented machinery for converting the world, should from every brother that walketh disorderly withdraw ourselves. * * * We selected from the list of epithets which our NEW-MEASURE brethren had most bountifully bestowed on us, that of 'Old School Baptists.'" (Editorials, Vol. I., p. 343.)

Elder Trott was another distinguished author among our Hardshell brethren. He wrote a History of the Old School Baptists about 1848, which was published in Winebrenner's History of All Religious Denominations in the United States. On pp. 86-87 of said History Elder Trott says:

"Formerly our churches and associations stood in connection with what are now Mission Baptists. Then a meeting was held of brethren from different associations and States, and an address published in 1832, setting forth the reasons why we could not longer give countenance to any of that mass of institutions and SOCIETIES which had been introduced among us, nor fellowship to those who should continue to adhere to them.

"This brought brethren, churches, and associations that had been GROANING under the burdens of HUMAN INVENTIONS and impositions in religion to SEPARATE themselves, some sooner, some later, from the whole mass of popular religionists, and to take a stand as a DISTINCT people upon the old Baptist standard, etc. This SEPARATION occasioned the splitting of several associations and MANY churches. We took as a distinguishing appellation the name of 'Old School Baptists.'"

This was only six years after the Hardshells began to split off and divide associations and churches, and to SEPARATE, as they say, from Regular Missionary Baptists. But let us hear another witness. Dr. Watson, Editor of the Old Baptist Test, says:

"After OUR painful SEPARATION from the missionaries in 1836 (they separated later in Tennessee than they did in Virginia) a number of churches in the bounds of the old Concord Association met together and formed the

Stone's River Association. We had then, as was generally supposed, a strong and happy union. But alas, there was an element of heresy incorporated in that body, as BAD if not WORSE than that from which we had just withdrawn." (Old Baptist Test, pp. 36, 37. See Throgmorton-Potter Debate, pp. 88, 89, 90.)

In the Signs of the Times, March 1, 1901, Editor Beebe, Jr., bears still later testimony to the fact that the Hardshells LEFT the Missionaries in 1832. He says: "Aside from the question of the truth or fallacy of the principles advocated by the SIGNS, they are the ones adopted by the brethren that assumed the name Old School Baptist, at Black Rock, Md., in 1832, at the time of the division or split from the Missionary or Freewill Baptists." (Signs of the Times, Vol. 69, No. 5, p. 150.)

This is the first, as it is the oldest, Hardshell paper in America. The Hardshells call all the Missionaries Freewills. It is interesting, not to say amusing, to note the lamentable appeals of these Hardshells and their charges and counter-charges against the missionaries which they confess were the Regular Baptists, from whom they had just SEPARATED. They had suddenly found out that Baptists had invented new schemes, that their liberties were taken away, that the yoke of bondage was being applied to the necks of thousands, that newly invented machinery for the conversion of the world, such as tract societies, theological seminaries, and all sorts of religious societies, were a curse and not a blessing. And, notwithstanding these things had been used, as Bogard declares, from the earliest times, they felt called upon to oppose them as the monster evil of their times. This they did to

the distraction of churches and associations, families and communities. What a striking parallel with the Landmark or Gospel Mission deflection of 1902. An amateur in ethnology could not fail to note their striking resemblance. They are of the same species. They are to the same manner born. They have the same parentage. They act alike, they talk alike, they ARE alike. And it will be a surprise to some of us if their fight on mission plans does not result alike. The following pages will disclose the fact that the modern Landmarkers have gone at least one step in advance of the Hardshells in denying the Scripturalness of Associations or any organization, other than a local church. In this respect they have outrun their Hardshell brothers. This is the logic of their teaching, but they reached it sooner than was expected. It will not surprise us if the Landmarkers find, as the Hardshells did, that in their new body—the General Association—there is an "element of heresy incorporated as bad, if not worse, than that from which they have separated."

We have said elsewhere in these pages that our Land-Mark-Gospel-Missioners are discarding Associations and all outside bodies, other than a local church, as unscriptural organizations. In proof of this statement we quote from their leading and standard writers whose publications have been more or less widely circulated among our Landmark brethren. If they were consistently carrying out their principles they would immediately discontinue their weekly and monthly publications, dissolve the Arkansas Baptist Publishing Company, disorganize the Landmark Baptist Book Concern, and not allow another tract or book published among them until the blast of silver trumptes

awakes the sleeping nations. The first witness we introduce is J. A. Scarboro.

He says: "The churches of Christ did their work from the establishment of Christianity until 1649 WITHOUT A MISSIONARY SOCIETY or Board OUTSIDE of local churches." (The Bible, the Baptists and the Board System, p. 9.) "Baptists deny (of course, he means Gospel Missioners, Ed.) Scripture authority for ALL ORGANIZATIONS exclusive of the one institution—the Church or churches of Christ—and this position excludes Conventions and ALL their creations from a Scriptural basis." (B. B. B., p. 58.)

"No sort of sophistry can answer or refute the fact that our machinery is costing* about as much as it gathers."

"Stop the man-made machine, let each church manage its own funds. Put ALL of it into missions, etc. It might be a little hard on the "organs" at first, but it would stop the newspaper fussing, etc. We could manage to get along with the Bible for a time, perhaps, and if there were less papers the people would have more time to read the Bible, and the change would not do much harm. As for the Colleges and Seminaries we have no idea that their suspension would wreck the solar system or cause the Holy Spirit to make an assignment for lack of preachers. The *education fad is a great talisman* to conjure Baptist pocketbooks, but a poor advocate of the hard facts. God established a Theological school in his churches; the Holy Spirit

*This may be true with the Landmarkers, Bro. Scarboro ought to know, as he is Treasurer of the General Association; but the machinery of the Southern Baptist Convention—cost of collections and disbursements and Secretary's salary—costs only ten cents on the dollar.

is the Teacher, and the Bible is the Text Book. Everybody can attend it, tuition free. The Colleges and Seminaries are the hot-beds of heresy." (B. B. B., pp. 413-414.)

Is the foregoing tirade on conventions, colleges, seminaries, and all societies, except a local church, calculated to convince the reader that Landmarkers are enthusiastically in favor of societies, schools and colleges?

Our next witness is

J. H. MILBURN.

He says: "The efforts of OTHER BODIES or ORGANIZATIONS to assume the work Christ committed only to his churches are evidently presumptious sins and as such are exceedingly offensive to God." (Mission Methods, p. 63.)

"Christ and his inspired Apostles undoubtedly understood as well as our Convention brethren and no inspired person ever said or did anything so far as the inspired record is concerned, to encourage the idea that the churches of Christ were not sufficient WITHIN THEMSELVES* to accomplish the work which Christ assigned them. Every SOCIETY or organization which proposes to undertake the evangelization of the world proclaims to the world by its very EXISTENCE that Divine wisdom failed to furnish the churches the FACILITIES to acomplish the work assigned; they also proclaim by their EXISTENCE that the Scriptures are not an all-sufficient rule of faith and practice for the children of God." (M. Methods, p. 251.)

"No Apostle nor inspired person ever chose any OTHER organization through which to evangelize the world than the

*That is, without Christian newspapers, publication societies, and without books on Mission Methods.—Ed.

church. The primitive churches themselves never chose ANY OTHER organization through which to evangelize the world; . . . Baptist churches GOT ALONG for over seventeen hundred years without choosing ANY OTHER organization through which to evangelize the world, than the churches of Christ. . . . To choose any OTHER organization or MEDIUM through which to evangelize the world, than the churches REFLECTS on the WISDOM of Christ. . . . The like of this offers an INSULT to Christ and to the Holy Spirit." (M. Methods, p. 281.)

"Of all the blighting and withering CURSES with which the Baptist cause has ever been CURSED Theological Seminaries have been and are the WORST." (M. Methods, p. 221.)

If these be not the words of a madman, driven insane by the continued maltreatment of his brethren, they can mean but ONE thing, and that is: The New Testament Churches had no Sunday Schools, therefore, we should have no Sunday Schools; the New Testament churches had no religious newspapers, therefore, we should have no religious newspapers; the New Testament churches had no Book Houses, therefore, we should have no book houses; the New Testament churches had no publication societies, therefore, we should have no publication societies; the New Testament churches had no outside organizations of any kind whatsoever, therefore, WE should have no outside organizations of any kind whatsoever; the New Testament churches had no books published on Missions and Mission Methods, therefore, WE should have no books published on Missions and Mission Methods; the New Testament churches had

no mission Committee, consisting of just thirty members, whose business it was to recommend missionaries to the churches, therefore, WE should have no mission Committee of thirty members to recommend missionaries to the churches like the Committee of the General Association; the New Testament churches had no Theological Seminaries, therefore, "of all the blighting and withering curses with which the Baptist cause has ever been cursed Theological Seminaries are the worst." Such is the logic (?) of Rev. J. H. Milburn, Editor, Author and Pugilist. Shades of Aristotle, Kepler and Byron! Reader, think of it. All the traitors and liars and adulterers and fornicators, known or unknown, with which the church has been CURSED, from Judas Iscariot to Bill Hicks—ALL these have not been such "blighting and withering curses," in the judgment of Rev. J. H. Milburn, as Theological Seminaries.

The next witness we introduce to prove that the Landmarkers are in principle against Associations, Committees, or any organization, other than a local church is

W. M. WEBB,

the Managing Editor of the Arkansas Baptist, which is the organ of the Landmark Association. Editor Webb says:

"Baptist churches are the ONLY DIVINE organizations in the world." (Arkansas Baptist, Feb. 2, 1910.)

"There is no Scripture authorizing ANY KIND of an organized body for doing mission work or executing the commission as delivered by Jesus Christ and recorded in Matt. 28:19, 20, EXCEPT the churches of Jesus Christ.

"Jesus nowhere authorizes his churches to be constituent parts of ANY other organized body. There is no Scrip-

ture for a *treasurer* to receive and disburse funds as he may decide best." (In Ark. Bap., Feb. 10, 1910.)

"Churches of Christ should take back their God-given commission; send out and support their own missionaries independent of any kind of modern organizations, started by men." (In Ark. Bap., March 30, 1910.)

"We belong to that class of Baptists who believe that the churches of Jesus Christ are fully competent to meet the religious needs of all God's people and they can do that without the help of any outside, HUMAN organization. They are the only divine organizations in the world today. All others are but *cumberers of the ground* and some day our Heavenly Father will CUT THEM DOWN." (In Ark. Bap., Dec. 15, 1909.)

"If conventions, Boards and ASSOCIATIONS are not mentioned in the Bible and were unknown among Baptists for over 1,600 years, why do so many of our learned brethren still contend and support them to the disparagement of the churches of Christ? Associations are of human origin. No ASSOCIATION existed till about 1650, and no mission SOCIETY apart from the church till 1792." (In Ark. Bap., Sept. 7, 1910).

"Of course, everyone knows that Jesus never commissioned his churches to build SCHOOLS," etc. (In Ark. Bap., May 11, 1910.)

"The Central Baptist Church (Little Rock) have agreed to do their mission work on the New Testament plan—independent of ALL GENERAL ORGANIZATIONS and direct from church to missionary." (Webb, in A. B., June 8, 1910.)

Of the things the Landmarkers stand for, this is the

sum: No organization but a local church, no mission societies, no conventions, no publication societies, no Associations, and no Treasurers of Associations. According to Webb, every organization but a church—our Sunday schools, newspaper organizations, publication societies, conventions, book concerns, seminaries, and even our associations, are human institutions, which are but "cumberers of the ground and some day our Heavenly Father will cut them down."

This is Landmarkism, Gospel missionism, and Webbism pure and simple. Perhaps the reader has already soliloquized with himself: Why is W. M. Webb, who is opposed to any kind of conventions or associations, and all kinds of organizations other than a local church; why is he yet retained as the Managing Editor of the Arkansas Baptist? Webb has as little fellowship for the General Association Committee of thirty that recommends and appoints missionaries as he has for the State Convention Board of sixty, which recommends and appoints missionaries. The Board is appointed by the Convention, and none but messengers can represent in the Convention; the Committee is appointed by the General Association, and none but messengers can represent in the Association. Then why do they retain him as Editor?

We will now introduce Bro. Webb's fellowhelper, the Editor in Chief of the Arkansas Baptist,

BEN M. BOGARD,

whom Milburn says is the "greatest oral controversialist in the United States." While Milburn may have him just a little overrated, as we think he has, yet with the Land-

markers in this section Bogard is Yea and Amen—he is their leading oracle. But hear what he says:

"The ONLY organized effort recognized in the New Testament for the WORK of missions is the LOCAL congregations of baptized believers. Since the commission to evangelize the world was given to the churches it follows that the churches are the ONLY organizations authorized to do mission WORK. Any OTHER organization that may undertake the WORK is a USURPER, a LAW-BREAKER, no matter how good the intention of such an organization may be. The Lord gave the commission to evangelize the world to the church. The Church still holds that commission and any Convention or BOARD that presumes to do the WORK is going into the work without a commission and is a USURPER, a violator of Divine law. The INDIVIDUAL Church should send the missionary. Nowhere in the Scriptures do we read of a Convention appointing a BOARD or COMMITTEE for any purpose whatever. Such a thing as a Convention is unknown to the Scriptures. Such a thing is, therefore, a USURPER, a VIOLATOR of Divine law and should not be TOLERATED by the Churches." (Bogard, Baptist-Way Book, 1908, pp. 24, 25, 26, 27.)

This is the same Ben M. Bogard who declared that Conventions and Boards were settled by the Scriptures, were Scriptural (Christian Union, pp. 56-64), and that those who use them are the Primitive Baptists, but those who do NOT use them are NOT the Primitive Baptists. (Way-Book, pp. 24-27.)

And he has been selling both of these books at the same time in the same community. In which of them does he

P. J. LIBRARY K. C. K.

tell the TRUTH? Can a fountain send forth both pure and salt water? In their search for some new method that appeals to the inherent mercenary motive in men, like Taylor and Parker and Alexander Campbell, Scarboro and Milburn and Webb and Bogard have not only denounced Conventions in the most intemperate terms, but they have pronounced as unscriptural all ASSOCIATIONS, Committees, Boards, SOCIETIES, in fact ALL organizations besides a local Church. They and the Founder of Campbellism, cited elsewhere in these pages, occupy common ground on the mission question. The Hardshells, after eighty years of drifting, have not yet gotten so far along as to denounce ASSOCIATIONS as unscriptural. But this is the inevitable logic of Scarboroism, Milburnism, Webbism, Bogardism, Landmarkism of the modern type. It is Hardshellism raised to the Nth power. No Conventions, no Boards, no Associations, no Committees, no Treasurers: ALL these, according to Bogard, are "usurpers and violators of Divine law, and should not be tolerated by the Churches." See his own words.

The whole trend of this Gospel Mission movement is toward Hardshellism. Everything they write on the subject points that way. Read again carefully their own words. W. M. Webb, Office Editor Arkansas Baptist, says:

"Brother M. P. Matheny preached a great Gospel Mission sermon at the General Association. (Dec., 1909.) He declared that the Scriptures knew nothing of Committes, Boards, Associations and Conventions, etc. He truly said that ALL the co-operation known to the Word of God was co-operation between the preacher, the Holy Spirit and the churches. It was TRULY a great sermon

and it was WELL received by the CONGREGATION." (In Ark. Bap., Dec. 22, 1909.)

If they do not in the foregoing words deny the Scripturalness of Committees and Associations et al, words are without meaning. Yet this same M. P. Matheny was made Chairman of a Missionary Committee of thirty members by that same Landmark Association before whom he preached that "great sermon" against the Scripturalness of "Committees and Associations."

He is NOW (1910) Chairman of a Board of Trustees of sixteen members, and a member of the Executive Committee of the State Association," the duty of which Committee will be to EXECUTE the expressed will of the co-operating churches through their mesengers to this Association during the INTERIM in aiding the churches as their Committee in the distribution of information, LOCATING and recomending FIELDS of labor for missionaries, in RAISING and distributing FUNDS," etc. (Minutes, 1910.) Truly the legs of the lame are not equal. They say Committees are Unscriptural, yet they have such Committees; they say Associations are Unscriptural, yet they work with such Associations; they say that "Theological schools are the most blighting and withering CURSES with which our Baptist cause has ever been CURSED" (see Milburn), yet this man who declares every institution Unscriptural, except a local church, is made Chairman of a Board of Trustees with the view of trying to build a theological school, which one of their leading writers declares is a "withering CURSE," a denominational school which Ben M. Bogard, the Editor of their State organ, declares *should not* exist. On this Bogard has spoken posi-

tively. He says: *"We do NOT believe there OUGHT to be any DENOMINATIONAL Schools. Let the individual and the State educate, and let the churches evangelize.* THAT, IN BRIEF, IS OUR DOCTRINE." (Bogard in Landmark Baptist, now Ark. Bap., April 20, 1904.) If Bogard is honest in what he says then he does not believe in denominational schools; if he is NOT honest in what he says, then he is a wolf in sheep's clothing. But if he does not believe in denominational schools, as he positively avers, then why, WHY, is he indorsed as the Editor of their State paper? There can be but ONE answer: The Landmark Association is, in principle, as their leaders affirm, against theological schools, colleges, and all outside organizations, other than a local church. They are going toward Hardshellism at a rapid pace if their *own* words are to be relied on; their progress in that direction will appear to all who read their published utterances.

Note carefully what these Landmark agitators say in their publications extant and you will agree with us that Milburnism and Clarkism and Mathenyism and Webbism and Bogardism and Scarboroism is none other than embryonic Campbellism and infantile Hardshellism sandwiched with enough truth to mislead a few unwary but honest enthusiasts. Strike the parallel and see for yourself. First, take

THE LANDMARKERS.

Hear W. M. Webb, present Office Editor of the Arkansas Baptist:

"There is no Scripture authorizing any kind of an organized body for doing mission work, etc., except the

churches of Jesus Christ. Jesus nowhere authorizes his churches to be constituent parts of any other organized body. There is no Scripture for a Treasurer to receive and disburse funds as he may decide best." (Arkansas Baptist, Feb. 10, 1910.) Again he says: "If Conventions, Boards and ASSOCIATIONS, are not mentioned in the Bible and were unknown among Baptists for over 1,600 years, why do so many of our learned brethren contend and support them?" (In Ark. Bap., Sep., 1910.)

If that is not ANTI-association and ANTI-organization, we don't know how to read. Next take M. P. Matheny, who is member of their Executive Mission Committee, Chairman of a College Board, and Moderator of the General Association for 1910-1911. Of this triple office Brother, Editor Webb says:

"Brother M. P. Matheny preached a great gospel mission sermon at the General Association. (Dec., 1909.) He declared that the Scriptures knew nothing of Committees, Boards, Associations, etc. He TRULY SAID* that ALL the co-operation known to the Word of God was co-operation between the preacher, the Holy Spirit and the churches. It was TRULY a great sermon, and it was well received by the CONGREGATION." (Webb, Ark. Bap., Dec. 22, 1909.)

According to Editor Webb, the General Association evidently approved that sermon, and, therefore, they go before the public as declaring that Committees and Associations, and ALL like organizations are unscriptural. If this be not true, words have no meaning. Now take W. A. Clark, who for twenty-five years edited the Arkansas Bap-

*Here Webb fully endorsed Matheny's position.—Ed.

tist in the interest of the Arkansas Baptist State Convention, but for reasons turned the paper against the Convention. Dr. Clark says: "This is the age of organization and organization may mean some good, but it is fraught with many perils. Organization implies leadership in an ASSOCIATION, in which individual interests are pooled and controlled by the management, and the management endowed with a power that chafes at criticism. As a result of this pooling of the "Energies" of the Baptist churches in the South, a horde of ecclesiastical and clerical bosses has been created, whose passion for power is insatiable and whose consciences are merged into the ORGANIZATION." (Ark. Baptist, 1904.)

That language is clearly against associations and all other organizations, other than a local church, whose purpose is to do mission work.

Hear J. H. Milburn, an author and religious pugilist of no mean repute among the Landmarkers; no one can mistake his meaning. He says:

"Christ and the inspired Apostles undoubtedly understood as well as our Convention brethren and no inspired person ever said or did anything so far as the inspired record is concerned, to encourage the idea that the churches of Christ were not sufficient WITHIN THEMSELVES (without Associations, etc.—Ed.) to accomplish the work which Christ assigned them. Every SOCIETY or organization which proposes to undertake the evangelization of the world proclaims to the world by its very existence that divine wisdom failed to furnish the churches the facilities to accomplish the work assigned; they also proclaim by their existence that the Scriptures are NOT an all-suffi-

cient rule of faith and practice for the children of God." (Mission Methods, pp. 251, 252.) Again, the same author says:

"No Apostle nor inspired person ever chose any OTHER organization through which to evangelize the world than the church. The primitive churches themselves never chose any OTHER organization through which to evangelize the world. Baptist churches got along *for over seventeen hundred years without choosing any* OTHER organization through which to evangelize the world than the Churches of Christ. To choose any OTHER organization or MEDIUM through which to evangelize the world, than the churches, reflects on the wisdom of Christ. The like of this offers an insult to Christ and to the Holy Spirit." (Idem, p. 281.)

The foregoing language of Dr. Milburn's may be a little confusing to the reader when it is known that the author of the language was actually a missionary during 1909-1910, sent out by the authority of the State Association with the avowed purpose of disrupting Convention churches. Said Association was organized in 1902, has its Moderator and Clerk and Treasurer and Mission Executive Committee, and is, therefore, an organization OTHER than a local church, and, according to Dr. Milburn, "offers an insult to Christ and to the Holy Spirit." Of religious schools Dr. Milburn has this to say: "Of all the blighting and withering curses with which the Baptist cause has ever been CURSED Theological Seminaries have been and ARE the WORST." (Mission Methods, p. 221.)

The reader will please carefully note the unmistakable opposition, both to organizations and schools in the fore-

going quotation. Yet they claim that they are in favor of religious schools. No wonder they have failed thus far in every attempt to build schools. Such duplicity is apparent to all. Next, take Dr. J. A. Scarboro, Editor of a little Monthly sheet very inappropriately called "Plain Truth," which is published in the defense of the General Association. About organizations and schools Dr. Scarboro writes as follows:

"The churches of Christ did their work from the establishment of Christianity until 1849 without a mission SOCIETY or Board OUTSIDE of local churches." (B. B. B., p. 9.) "Baptists deny (I. E., Landmarkers do. Ed.) Scripture authority for ALL organizations exclusive of the ONE institution—the Church or Churches of Christ." (B. B. B., p. 58.) "The Convention-Board system is TODAY (1903) the most dangerous enemy to Baptist principles on earth." (B. B. B., p. 269.) "The notion that a Seminary educated ministry can save the country needs proof. The EDUCATED FAD is a great talisman to conjure Baptist pocket-books. We have no objection to EDUCATION, to study or learning; what we do object to is the old Devil's LIE that the only place where one can be educated is in a COLLEGE. The Colleges and Seminaries are the hot-beds of heresy." (B. B. B., p. 414.)

Does such language indicate that its author is very enthusiastically in favor of colleges and seminaries? Such intemperate speech may be accounted for when we remember that the Author of the language above quoted was an ardent Convention man for twenty years and put the best of his life into the Convention work, as he himself con-

fesses, but for reasons left the Convention. (See Addenda.) We next introduce Ben M. Bogard, Editor, author, and religious pugilist for the Landmarkers. If Bogard is in favor of organized work the following language from his pen is meaningless:

"The ONLY organized effort recognized in the New Testament for the work of MISSIONS is the LOCAL congregation of baptized believers. Since the commission to evangelize the world was given to the churches, it follows that the churches are the ONLY organizations authorized to do mission work. Any OTHER organization that may undertake the work is a USURPER, a lawbreaker, no matter how good the intention of such an organization may be."

"The Lord gave the commission to evangelize the world to the Church. The Church still holds that commission and any Convention or Board that presumes to do the work is going into the work without a commission and is a USURPER, a violator of Divine law. The individual Church should SEND the missionary. Nowhere in the Scriptures do we read of a Convention appointing a Board or COMMITTEE for any purpose whatever. Such a thing as a CONVENTION is unknown to the Scriptures. Such a thing is therefore a Usurper, a Violator of Divine law, and should not be tolerated by the Churches." (Baptist Way-Book, 1908, pp. 24-27.)

On the question of Schools, Editor Bogard says:

"We do not believe there ought to be ANY DENOMINATIONAL schools. Let the individual and the State EDUCATE, and let the churches evangelize. That in

brief is OUR doctrine." (Landmark Baptist, April 20, 1904.)

This is the same Ben M. Bogard who declares with such confidence in one Book that Conventions and Boards and Committees are Scriptural, and that those who use them are Primitive Baptists (Christian Union, pp. 56-64), and positively avers in another Book that Conventions and Boards and Committees are NOT Scriptural, and that those who DO use them are NOT Primitive Baptists. (Way-Book, pp. 24-27.)

In the foregoing quotation Bogard is opposed to "a Board or Committee for any purpose whatever." Yet this same Bogard, who does not believe in "denominational schools," nor "Boards nor Committees," and "no organizations outside of the churches," is NOW (1910) a member of the Board of the "Southern Baptist University" which they hope to build, CHAIRMAN of the Executive Committee of the State Association, and the author of a Resolution providing "That a Committee of three be APPOINTED by the Moderator (of the State Association), which shall give bond in the sum of at least $5,000, who shall have in charge the permanent Bible and Tract Fund. This COMMITTEE is instructed to publish cheap or free literature setting forth Landmark principles and explaining our METHODS of work; also to distribute cheap or free Testaments and Bibles. That this Bible and Tract Committee be instructed to make REPORTS to the State Association. Ben M. Bogard." (Minutes State Association, 1910, pp. 2, 27.) He is the same Ben M. Bogard who said this week editorially:

"We must have NO organization outside of the churches.

As to the New Testament, UNDOUBTEDLY there was at least ONE association—the Macedonian Association—that had a Committee, that elected messengers, and those messengers MET together." (Ark. Baptist, Dec. 14, 1910, p. 8.)

With such leaders carrying fast and loose, first on one side and then on the other, is it any wonder that "some of the brethren keep saying that ASSOCIATIONS were unknown to the Bible and for the first seventeen hundred years after Christ." (Bogard, Ark. Bap., Dec. 14, 1910, p. 8.) Should it astonish anyone that: "It is high time that Landmark Baptists cease to misrepresent one another and thus help the Conventionites to tear down the work which it has taken years of toil and hardship, amidst persecution, to establish." (Bogard, A. B., Dec. 14, 1910, p. 8.) If the Leaders be dogmatically on both sides of the Mission question at the same times, sometimes, as Milburn and Scarboro and Bogard are shown to be by their own books, no marvel if their credulous followers get astride the fence and fuss among themselves about which side they are on. Just think of it. In one breath Bogard says:

"We must have NO organization OUTSIDE of the church. The State and General Associations are NOT organizations" (A. B., Dec. 14, 1910), and in the same article upbraids his confused followers for "misrepresenting one another."

Bogard has been Moderator of both the State and General Associations, and is NOW Chairman of their Mission Board or Committee, and a member of their Board of Trustees, and yet to cover up his "confusion worse con-

founded," he declares in his latest Editorial that "the State and General Associations are NOT organizations." Such filibustering and juggling with words is morally criminal in one that has sense enough to be Moderator of an Association or Chairman of a Committee. The "State Association NOT an organization?" On page 3 of Minutes of State Association we read:

"The State Association of Arkansas Baptist Churches met in the meeting house of Big Creek Baptist Church, Sheridan, Ark., on Thursday night at 7 o'clock, November 10, 1910. On motion of Eld. M. P. Matheny, the MESSENGERS went into permanent ORGANIZATION, waiving the report of the Enrollment Committee. The vote for Moderator and Clerk was taken by ballot without nominations, and resulted as follows: Eld. J. L. Brown, Moderator; W. R. Cross, Assistant Moderator; C. R. Powell, Clerk; J. A. Scarboro, Assistant Clerk. The Moderator APPOINTED Elders Wm. Tucker, Miles Kelley, and the pastor and messengers of Sheridan Church as a committee on Divine Services. Elders Ben M. Bogard, W. A. Crutchfield and J. I. Martin were appointed by the Moderator as a Committee on Order of Business. W. R. Cross offered an amendment to Article VII, Section 1, of the declaration of Principles; Adopted. J. A. Scarboro offered an amendment to Article X; adopted."

On page 7 of the same Minutes we read:

"Eld. J. A. Scarboro read a resolution on Education, which was adopted, and J. A. Scarboro, Ben M. Bogard and M. P. Matheny were appointed to carry out the provisions of the resolution. On motion the MESSENGERS went into the SELECTION of four missionaries, which

resulted as follows: W. E. Sherrill, C. R. Pole, J. L. Brown, B. F. Holford."

On page 27 of the same Minutes we find the following Resolution offered by Dr. Scarboro, which was adopted. Carefully note this Resolution in the light of his tirade on Theological Schools, given elsewhere in this book:

"Resolved 2. That in the matter of a Theological School, we favor the establishment of such a concern for all our people, etc. And in order to further this enterprise this Association appoint a COMMITTEE of three, empowering them to confer with the General Association at its approaching session, and with like COMMITTEES, churches or Associations in the States, with a view to securing the co-operation of all our Landmark Baptists in the establishment of a Landmark Baptist Theological School for ALL the States, and this COMMITTEE to proceed to co-operate with any COMMITTEE of the General Association in the prosecution of the enterprise, and report both to the next SESSION of this body."

Is there any organization about that? Is not a BODY which elects a Moderator, Clerk, Treasurer, appoints Committees and Boards of Trustees, elects missionaries, passes resolutions to build theological schools, adopts and amends Declarations of Principles, and which is a self-constituted Ecclesiastical Inquisition for the whole denomination; is not such a body an ORGANIZATION? Why wonder that there is so much calumny, and acrimonious conflict among them every time they meet? The wonder is that there is not more. We think the words of their Committee on Education, which was intended for Convention people, will apply in this case most fittingly:

"There is a learning that makes exceeding MAD against God and divine things and we have MUCH of that kind of learning in our day, but that is not the kind which Paul had and we want for our children." (Minutes State Association, p. 11.)

But some of our brethren are to be pitied rather than blamed, because they just can't help it; they are put together wrong. A nobleman, so the story goes, owned a very fine canine of which he was very fond. But the dog's plaintive cries would sometimes almost drive its owner distracted. While in a rage the nobleman seized an ax and severed the dog from top to bottom, from lip to tip. After this rash act and time for serious reflection the nobleman became very serious and determined to reinstate his dog, which he did by re-uniting the parts together; but in his excitement, to his astonishment, in the process he reversed the parts, putting lip with tip and tip with lip, and the last state of that dog was worse than the first; for it walked both up and down and barked at both ends. It was just put together wrong. It was more to be pitied than censured.

CHAPTER IV.

Headed Toward Hardshellism.

But to further confirm our contention that these Landmarkers are headed toward ANTI-missions, rapidly approaching the Hardshell position, we will introduce the

HON. THOS. E. WATSON,

Editor Watson's Magazine, and The Jeffersonian, claimed by the Landmarkers as one of their latest recruits, and cordially endorsed by both Landmarkers and Hardshells; and it will take an official count to decide which of them is the more entitled to him. M. P. Matheny, Moderator of the General Association of Landmark Baptists, endorses Watson's position on the mission question:

"There are thousands on thousands who are satisfied that Mr. Watson is telling the truth, etc. Oh! for a thousand Watsons to battle against the wrongs in Church and State." (Matheny, Ark. Bap., Feb. 2, 1910.)

Ben M. Bogard, Editor Arkansas Baptist, endorses Watson:

"Thos. E. Watson writes with a pen that sparkles. The ink he uses is lightning. His exposure of religious and political humbuggery is COMPLETE. The exposure of Socialism and Conventionism has been going on for a year

and will continue. THANK God for Tom Watson." (Bogard, Ark. Bap., March 30, 1910.)

W. M. Webb, Office Editor of the Arkansas Baptist, heartily endorses Watson's position. He says:

"Let every lover of TRUTH pray God to give Tom Watson a glorious victory for the TRUTH." (Webb, Ark. Bap., Jan. 5, 1910.)

Again Webb says:

"Tom Watson is hitting some sledgehammer blows against the modern MISSION SYSTEM now operated by the Boards of the Southern Baptist Convention. All HONOR to the man who has the courage to OPPOSE, and EXPOSE, this Ungodly System of Greed and GRAFT." (Webb, Ark. Bap., Sept. 22, 1909.)

Our Hardshell friends can and DO heartily endorse Watson's position, for they understand him, and rightly, to be OPPOSED to Foreign Missions. The Landmarkers would make it appear that Watson is only opposed to the METHOD, but his own words will not support their claim. But hear the Hardshell's endorsement:

"Will our American people forever submit to being taxed to support the present unscriptural modern Mission System? Some of them, especially in Georgia, have had their eyes opened by the writings of that able, fearless and patriotic man, and we FEEL, Christian gentleman, Hon. Thos. E. Watson, and they seem to be calling a halt. The Idex, that was recently reporting more than $100 per day collection for Foreign Missions, is NOW reporting less than $25 per day. And yet some people pretend that they think Mr. Watson has no influence and that his EXPOSURE of FOREIGN MISSIONS will make the sys-

tem more popular." (R. H. P., in Primitive Baptist, and quoted approvingly in Baptist Trumpet of Nov. 24, 1910. Both straight Hardshell papers of the rankest type.—Ed.)

Now, what have these Landmarkers and Hardshells indorsed? It is not a question of theological pyrotechnics simply. They are not simply indorsing Tom Watson's political gymnastic perfomances, which have been changing as unsystematically as the weather, but they say frankly that they indorse his position on the Mission Question. But what is Watson's position on the mission question? Fortunately for Tom Watson, and unfortunately for these Landmarkers who have indorsed his position unqualifiedly, he has gotten off the fence and takes his stand squarely on the side of the Hardshells. Here is what Watson says:

"We find that the system now in operation is a total departure from the practice of Paul, of the disciples, and of the early Church,—therefore the burden of proof is upon the FANATICS who have fastened to us the system *which hires a heathen to call himself a Christian, and which tempts the needy of pagan lands to profess conversion by offering relief from physical suffering.*" (Foreign Missions Exposed, p. 23.)

Again Mr. Watson says:

"The Apostles did not squat down in any one community and depend upon the HOME CHURCH in Palestine to send out rations and money and medicine and clothes every year. The HOME CHURCH in Judea did not take up collections for the Pagans of Syria or Egypt. NO. The HOME CHURCH took care of itself, and left the new converts in Gentile lands to organize and support themselves. ALL that Paul and other pioneers of Christ

did was TO HELP THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCHES WITH ADVICE AND INSTRUCTIONS. Study those letters in the New Testament and convince yourself. Paul did not set up any schools for secular training. He left all such matters to the PEOPLE of the several communities in which he labored. He did not found colleges to teach the children of Roman parents, Greek or Hebrew. NO. He taught the Gospel of Christ, JUST AS THE DISCIPLES DID, and he made THAT the measure of his mission."

"Can you picture Paul running a dispensary, and tramping around loaded up with patent medicines, porous plasters and surgical instruments, eager to give free treatment to diseased Mexicans, Brazilians, Koreans and Ceylonese? Can you imagine Paul PESTERING THE HOME CHURCH to DEATH with his everlasting HOWLS for more money—more for the kindergarten in Rome, more for the college at Antioch, more for the free schools in Greece, and thus making his own country bear the expense of doing what Antioch, Rome and Greece should do for themselves? Above ALL, can you for one instant believe that Paul would have given regular SALARIES to the new converts, thus creating the impression among the POOR FOLKS of Antioch and Rome *that it would PAY to turn Christian?* NO. It is inconceivable. Paul's converts organized their own churches, and all the help they ever asked and got from him was ADVICE. His converts were real, genuine Christians, and they supported THEIR OWN churches and schools. Not only that, they sent AID to Paul and they put missionaries in DISTANT Fields." (Foreign Missions Exposed, p. 24.)

Again:

"I urged our people to stop where Christ STOPPED, where the disciples stopped, where Paul and the early Fathers stopped. I urge our people not to do MORE for the heathen than Paul and the disciples did, until we have FIRST discharged our FULL DUTY to our own flesh and blood, our OWN kith and kin, our own national household." (Idem., p. 32.)

Again:

"Why do boys run off from home to join the army, or go to sea? Because it appeals to their IMAGINATION. To put the plow-gear on old Mike, the mule, and go to the field where the steady feet must walk one monotonous furrow after another, with loose soil getting into the shoes and the hot sun baking the head, is honorable but not romantic. But to run away and join the army! To slip off some night and go to sea! THERE'S novelty for you, and romance and adventure. The imagination kindles at the thought, fancy paints such a career in colors of uniform brightness, and there they go, the Peter Simples and Barry Lyndons and ALL their intermediate types—to learn in due time that it MIGHT HAVE ANSWERED QUITE AS WELL TO HAVE STAYED AT HOME. Something of the SAME feeling tempts men and women INTO FOREIGN MISSIONS." (Idem., p. 42.)

But hear him further:

"Who is it that knows to a certainty that a single Oriental has ever become a sincere Christian? Who is it that does not know that if these Eastern people will live up to their OWN RELIGIOUS CREEDS they will be good

men and women—JUST AS GOOD AS WE ARE?" (Mark well that statement—Ed.)

"Let us have no *narrow-minded foolishness about this:* ask any honest scholar and he will tell you that these Eastern peoples had a BEAUTIFUL, REFINING and INSPIRING CODE of morality LONG BEFORE Christians met in CONVENTION to vote the ADOPTION of these separate writings which constitute the Bible. John Wesley maintained that a heathen who lived according to the best light he had would be SAVED. Is it not the general belief, in this age of INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM, that a Mohammedan, a Buddhist, or a disciple of Confucius, who HONESTLY believes in the religion of his fathers and who does his utmost to live according to its teachings, will NOT be damned to EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT? The CREED of these people, when faithfully observed, MAKE GOOD MEN; and have not our very best preachers declared that our Christian religion means: BEING GOOD AND DOING GOOD? Will the Father of US ALL send GOOD PEOPLE to broil in an eternal HELL? John Wesley said, NO. Who will say, YES?" (Idem., pp. 77-78.)

"To teach and preach abroad is about the same NOW as teaching and preaching here. To run the hospital and boss the commissary is no more fatiguing in South America and the Orient than it is in Europe or America. Dearly beloved, don't weep any more over the hard life of the foreign missionary. The chances are that he is having a much better time than YOURSELF. He wears up-to-date habiliments, lives on appetizing viands, has

comfortable and roomy quarters, smokes good cigars when he wants to, and has a CORKING TIME GENERALLY." (Idem, p. 83.)

But again:

"How our noble Christian women can rest in peace while this diabolical traffic (the white slave trade.—Ed.) is going on; how it is that they can go GADDING ABOUT THE FOREIGN WORLD, ministering to BLACK women in Africa, BROWN women in Hindustan and YELLOW women in China,—when there is SO MUCH of agonizing TRAGEDY at their own doors, is difficult to understand." (Idem, p. 90.)

Finally:

"It is a SIN AND A SHAME—a BURNING wrong and disgrace—that we should be forcing these Missionaries upon the ALLEGED heathen when we need them so badly for millions of our OWN boys and girls. Miss Houston's own labors have been principally in Cuba and Mexico, Christian COUNTRIES, BOTH. For hundreds of years they have been Christian, just as Europe is Christian, and just as Armenia is Christian. It is certainly a phenomenal state of affairs when the churches of this country are asked to PUT UP the CASH for missionary work among peoples who have been Christianized for ages. Armenia was 'won for Christ' more than eighteen hundred years ago, and yet we must furnish money for MISSIONARY preachers, schools and colleges in Armenia." (Idem, p. 94.)

These quotations are the GIST of all Mr. Watson has said in a Pamphlet of 97 pages. Can any of our readers doubt for a moment that Tom Watson is against

Foreign Missions? Do you wonder that the rankest of the Hardshells indorse his position? And THIS is what Bogard, and Matheny, and Webb have so ardently indorsed. Please note again carefully what Mr. Watson says, upon which we make the following observations:

1. The foregoing language from our politico-religio-critic demonstrates the fact that Landmarkism is awfully contagious and that Brother Watson is very susceptible to such infectious diseases. Though but an amateur in the field of religious controversy he has already developed in large measure the two most effective qualities in the defense of modern Landmarkism: the gifts of innuendo and misrepresentation. He has caught the real spirit of Gospel Missions. Their motto is to charge and counter-charge and surcharge and then discharge. Mr. Watson's insinnation that the Foreign Mission Board "hires a heathen to call himself a Christian, and tempts the needy of pagan lands to profess conversion by offering RELIEF from physical suffering," we denounce as a base fabrication, a creation of the system which he has espoused, and a misrepresentation of some of the best men upon whom the sun shines. It's a slander on Jesus and His Apostles. But Tom Watson was born in the past tense, subjective mode, the objective case, and the object of the verb: Retrench. He has been drunk so long on the strong drinks of populism and Bryanism that every time a leaf moves he sees snakes. His modus operandi has ever been to create suspicion and distrust, then appeal to said distrust and suspicion to accomplish his purpose. He has been a critic so long that he is really in a critical condition.

Did not Jesus heal the sick, feed the hungry, clothe the

naked demoniac, unstop the deaf ears, restore sight, pay taxes for the preacher, cast out devils, and raise the dead? Did not the Apostles do likewise? Were not all these benevolent acts given in "RELIEF from physical suffering?" Did Jesus and His disciples "hire these needy ones to become Christians and TEMPT them to profess conversion by offering them relief from physical suffering?"

2. Who informed Mr. Watson that the "Apostles did NOT SQUAT down in any one community and depend upon the home church?" They did "squat down" at Jerusalem, and remained there until persecution drove them all from the city except the preachers (Acts 8:1), and they DID DEPEND "upon the home Church in Palestine to send out rations and money and medicine and clothes," for they "sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need." (Acts 2:45.) If they needed rations they got them, if they needed money they got it, if they needed medicine they got it, if they needed clothes they got it; and who is Thos. E. Watson, that he should declare in the face of Inspiration that it isn't SO?

Paul "squatted down" at Corinth, "and he continued there a year and six months, teaching the word of God among the people." (Acts 18:11.) He also "squatted down" at Rome, "and Paul dwelt TWO WHOLE YEARS in his own HIRED house, and received all that came in unto him; preaching the kingdom of God, and TEACHING those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with ALL CONFIDENCE, no man forbidding him." (Acts 28:30-31.) Did Paul bear his own expenses on all these missionary tours? Did he depend upon the mission

station, or did he depend upon the "home churches?" He shall be his own witness:

"Have I committed an offense in abasing myself that ye might be exalted, because I have preached to you the Gospel of God freely? I robbed OTHER churches to do YOU service. And when I was present with you and wanted, I was chargeable to NO MAN (among you Corinthians, of course.—Ed.), for that which was lacking to me the brethren which came from Macedonia supplied: and in all things I have kept myself from being burdensome to YOU, and so will I keep myself." (2 Cor. 11:7-9.)

But who were these brethren who supplied his need when he was on the mission field?

"And when Silas and Timotheus were come from Macedonia, Paul was pressed in the spirit, and testified to the Jews that Jesus was the Christ." (Acts 18:5.)

Later, when adverting to the kindness of one of these home churches, and her loyalty to the mission enterprise, he says:

"Now, ye Philippians know also, that in the beginning of the Gospel, when I departed from Macedonia, NO CHURCH communicated with me as concerning giving and receiving, but YE ONLY. For EVEN in Thessalonia ye sent once and again unto my necessity. Not because I desire a GIFT; but I desire FRUIT that may abound to your account. But I have ALL, and abound: I am FULL, having received of Epaphroditus the things which were sent from YOU, an odor of a sweet smell, a SACRIFICE acceptable, WELL-PLEASING to God. But my God shall supply all YOUR NEED according to His riches in glory by Jesus Christ." (Phil. 4:15-19.)

The churches SUPPLIED ALL His need, whether it were bread, clothing, medicine, house rent for Paul's "own hired house." The command is to "GO, MAKE disciples, and baptize them, and teach them." (Matthew 28:19-20.) If you haven't got a place to preach, get one; if you have not a place to baptize, make one; if you may not be admitted to the schools already to hand, like the School of Tyrannus (Acts 91:9), BUILD ONE. When the missionaries can speak with tongues without learning them, and when the natives can understand without being taught, then let our critic stand up and he shall be heard. If Tom Watson cannot keep this civilized country half straight, either politically or religiously, *with* a "Jeffersonian Magazine" and a "Weekly Jeffersonian," HOW can the Churches reach the Priest-ridden Papal field, where the people are kept in ignorance, or the idolater who bows to stocks and stones, *without* schools and colleges and the Word of God?

3. But our critic continues: "Can you picture Paul running a dispensary, eager to give free treatment, etc?" Wrong again, Bro. Watson. Get your Bible. In the very beginning, healing and preaching and teaching went together. Jesus himself set the example, and commanded others to do likewise:

"And Jesus went about all Galilee, Teaching in their synagogues, and Preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and Healing all manner of sickness and all manner of disease among the people." (Matt. 4:23.)

The twelve did the same thing:

"And when He had called unto him His twelve disciples, He gave them power against unclean spirits to cast

them out, and to HEAL all manner of sickness and all manner of disease. These twelve Jesus sent forth, saying: 'As ye GO, preach, saying the kingdom of heaven is at hand.'" (Matt. 10:1-7.)

The same principle and practice was adhered to with the seventy evangelists:

"After these things the Lord appointed other seventy also, and sent them two and two before His face, into every city and place, whither He Himself would come. Therefore said He unto them: 'Go your ways; carry neither purse, nor script, nor shoes; the laborer is worthy of his HIRE, etc. HEAL the sick, and say unto them, The kingdom of God is come nigh unto you." (Lu. 10:1-11.) Peter and John healed the lame man at the gate. Beautiful, and attracted the admiration and attention of ALL the people for their good. (Acts 3:1-16.) Peter also gave Eneas "relief from physical suffering," and "all that dwelt in Lydda and Sara saw him and turned to the Lord." (Acts 9:32-35.)

Were they "hired to profess conversion," Brother Watson? Did it PAY to give attention to their bodily suffering; pay religiously?

When that impotent man was HEALED at Lystra, "and when the people saw what Paul had done, they lifted up their voices, saying in the speech of Lycaonia: The gods are come down to us in the likeness of men." When they gave the man "relief from physical suffering," Paul and Barnabas "Preached unto them that they should turn from these vanities to the living God." (Acts 14:8-15.) But it will be said: This was miraculous healing. Well. But the principle was there just the same. Heal, preach,

teach—was their program. And Paul was certainly NOT a Landmarker nor a Hardshell of the Watson and Bogard and Milburn and Scarboro and Webb type, for he kept Luke, "the beloved physician," right by his side. (Col. 4:14; 2 Tim. 4:11.) But our critic says: "I urged our people to STOP where Christ stopped, where the disciples stopped, where Paul and the early Fathers stopped. I URGE our people NOT to do MORE for the heathen than Paul and the disciples did." All right, Bro. Watson, when you Hardshells and Landmarkers get to healing without a physician, we'll call in all our medical missionaries off the field. Put up, Bro. Watson, or shut up. The Landmarkers are afraid we'll do too much. They are the watch-dogs of the denominational treasury. And they are proud of their self-appointed task. They are afraid the money that somebody ELSE gives will be misspent, and the Lord's treasury will become depleted. They "urge the people not to do MORE for the heathen than Paul and the disciples did, UNTIL we have first discharged our FULL duty to our own flesh and blood, our own kith and kin, our own national household." Be it said to their credit, that they consistently practice what they preach in this regard. The General Association of the whole United States of America received last year "for all the work" the enormous sum of $6,495.68. This was for their Foreign and Home Mission work for 1909. (See Minutes General Association, 1909, p. 17.) We admire their consistency, but deplore their arrogance and delinquency. It is not their poverty; they have the money. But their leaders, like Watson & Co., "urge them not to do *more* than Paul did" for the heathen until they have converted America.

The result is they are doing practically nothing at home or abroad but to sit in judgment on the money that other folks give. They spend their time tabulating statistics and juggling with figures to make false impressions, and then raise the howl that the "Lord's money," not one dollar of which THEY have given, is misused to pay doctors and teachers and blacksmiths, etc. If their CONTRIBUTIONS were equal to their CASTIGATIONS, the very mountains would tremble before the onward march of our missionary forces. But these critics, these SELF-appointed critics! How they love their job! What a fuss they make! But it has ever been true that a pullet will make more noise when she lays her first little egg than a ten-mule team pulling a commissary department. "We beseech you, brethren, that ye increase more and more, that ye study to be QUIET, and to DO YOUR OWN BUSINESS, and to WORK with your OWN hands, that ye may walk HONESTLY toward them that are without." (Paul, 1 Thess. 4:10-12.)

Such advice, however, is wholly out of place to Landmarkers, who are practically out of the Lord's business, and have no business of their own but to FUSS; for how can they, whose business it is to FUSS, "be QUIET and do their own business?" The Landmark General Association of the United States raised for ALL purposes last year (1909), as reported in their Minutes, $6,495.68. They reported ten missionaries: seven at work as Home Missionaries in the United States, reporting 199 baptisms; three of them were Foreign Missionaries, at least ONE of whom is a Physician, all reporting 19 baptisms. They separated from the Regular Missionary Baptists in April, 1902, and

organized the State Landmark Association, and later the General Association. These are the folks who are so loud in their complaints of what Convention people do. Should they not DO more, and FUSS less?

4. But did Paul and the other Disciples convert every one in the home field before they went abroad? To the law and the testimony; if they speak not according this word, it is because there is no light in them." (Isa. 8:20.) Get your Book, Brother Watson. Their very Commission forbade them staying at HOME until they had converted all their "own flesh and blood, kith and kin, and their own national household." "This gospel of the kingdom," said Jesus, "shall be preached in ALL the world for a witness unto ALL nations; and THEN shall the end come." (Matt. 24:14.) "Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of ALL nations, baptizing them and teaching them," etc. (Matt. 28:19-20.) Again Jesus said: "Go ye into ALL THE WORLD, and preach the Gospel to EVERY creature." (Mark 16:15.) And again: "Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day, and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name AMONG ALL NATIONS, beginning at Jerusalem. And ye are witnesses of THESE THINGS. And behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you; but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem UNTIL ye be endued with power from on high." (Lu. 24:46-49.) "And he said unto them: Ye shall receive POWER, after that the Holy Spirit is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem (city missions), and in Judea (state missions), and Sama-

ria (home missions), and unto the uttermost part of the earth (foreign missions). (Acts 1:8.)

But the Watsonian-Hardshell-Landmark translation reads on this wise:

"The Convention folks are spending lots of money which WE DID NOT GIVE; STAY at HOME, therefore, until you have discharged your full duty to your own flesh and blood, kith and kin, your own national household. He that criticiseth the *most* and doeth the *least* shall be exalted to leadership among the Landmarkers, and, lo, he shall be lauded for his critical sagacity, and praised most wonderfully by the Hardshells for his opposition to Missions."

Now, we are morally certain that Paul and Barnabas were not Baptists after the Watsonian type; had they stayed at home like Watson "urges" his people to do, ALL Europe would probably have been without the Gospel till this day: "Now, when they had gone through Prygia and the region of Galatia, and were FORBIDDEN of the Holy Spirit to preach the word in Asia; after they were come to Mysia, they ASSAYED to go into Bithynia: but the Spirit suffered them NOT. And they passing by Mysia came down to Troas. And a vision appeared to Paul in the night; there stood a man of Macedonia and prayed him, saying: Come OVER INTO Macedonia and help us. And after he had seen the vision, immediately we endeavored to go into Macedonia, assuredly gathering that the Lord had called us for to preach the Gospel unto them." (Acts 16:6-34.)

These men wanted to stay at HOME, just as Watson URGES; they wanted to stay in their own nation until their "own kith and kin" were converted; they wanted to

be Landmark-Baptists, but the Spirit forbade them. The Apostle "assuredly gathered from the vision" that the Lord did not want him to stay in the homeland "until he had done his full duty to his own flesh and blood, kith and kin," that the Gospel must be preached "in all the world for a witness to all nations," that the Commission takes us from "Jerusalem to the uttermost part of the earth." If Brother Watson would read his Bible he would learn this much without a vision.

5. But our critic continues his castigations. We can almost hear his dying groans. Conventionism has pestered him NEARLY TO DEATH. He says:

"Can you imagine Paul PESTERING the home Church to DEATH with his everlasting howls for MORE MONEY, etc.?" There are two symptoms that will, without fail, help one to determine a sure-enough case of modern Landmarkism: (1) The patient dislikes exceedingly to be asked for money, and (2) he is ravenously fond of directing the money that other people give. All Hardshells are almost "pestered to death" by appeals for money. But did Paul pester the churches for money? Get your Bible, Brother Watson.

"Who goeth a warfare any time at his own charges?" (The Hardshells.) "Who planteth a vineyard, and eateth not of the fruit thereof?" (The Hardshells.) "Who feedeth a flock and eateth not of the milk of the flock?" (The Hardshells.) "If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things?" (Yes, it is a GREAT thing: Watson says it "pesters him nearly to death.") "Do ye not know that they which minister about holy things live of the things of the temple?

R. J. LIBRARY
K. C. K.
BAPTIST SEMINARY

and they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar?" (Yes, we knew it, but Watson says that such an "everlasting howl for money pesters him to death.") "Even SO hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel." (1 Cor. 9:7-14.) Yes, Paul, but HOW these appeals for money do "pester" our Landmark brethren. But the Apostle keeps up his cry for money:

"Moreover, brethren, we would have you know the grace of God bestowed on the churches of Macedonia (Philippi, Thessalonica, et al., that helped Paul when Corinth was a Missionary Station. 2 Cor. 11:8, 9; Phil. 4:15; Acts 18:1-8), how that in a great trial of affliction the abundance of their joy and their deep poverty abounded unto the riches of their liberality! for to their power, yea, and BEYOND their power they were willing of themselves, praying us that with much entreaty we would receive the GIFT and take upon us the fellowship of the ministering to the saints. And this they did, not as we hoped, but first gave their own selves to the Lord, and unto US by the will of God. Insomuch that we desired Titus, that as he had begun, so he would also finish in you the same grace also. Therefore, as ye abound in every thing (Hear it, Brother Watson), in Faith, and UTTERANCE (think our Landmark brethren are pretty well up on utterance), and knowledge, and in all diligence, and in your love to us, see that ye abound in this GRACE also. (The grace of giving.) I speak not by commandment (but our Landmark brethren say the METHOD is as much commanded as the doctrines and ordinances), but by occasion of the forwardness of others (Paul thought Corinth ought to try

to keep up with the procession), and to prove the sincerity of your LOVE. (Paul thought giving was a proof of sincerity and love; but such appeals "pesters the Landmarkers to death.") For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though He was rich, yet for your sakes He became poor, that ye through His poverty might be rich. And herein I give my ADVICE: for this is EXPEDIENT for you, who have begun before, not only to DO but also to be FORWARD a year ago. (Mission METHODS are not in the order of commandments, as the Landmarkers and Hardshells vainly teach, but they are in the role of expediency. How this does "pester" Brother Watson and the Gospel Mission brethren.) Now, therefore, perform the DOING of it; that as there was a readiness to will, so there may be a PERFORMANCE (hear it, Brother Watson) also out of that which ye have. For if there be first a willing mind it is accepted according to that a man hath, and NOT according to that he hath not. (But if there is an unwilling mind, it will croak, and criticise, and castigate, and calumniate, and calculate, and will NOT co-operate.) For I mean not that other men be eased, and ye burdened: but by an equality, that now at this time your abundance may be a supply for their want, that THEIR abundance also may be a supply for YOUR want: that there may be equality." (2 Cor. 8:1-14.)

This is exactly what Convention people do today: and exactly what Landmarkers say they are opposed to. We help where we think it will do the most good, and where such help promises the best returns for the kingdom of God. This was Paul's ADVICE, which he calls "expedient"—good policy. And THIS is what Watson & Co.

call "subsidizing, hiring the heathen to become Christians, and tempting them to profess conversion." Fortunately for Convention policies, we have Paul with us, if the Landmarkers are against us. No wonder this "everlasting howl for money pesters them to death." But Paul is not through; he keeps up "an everlasting howl about money." Hear him, Brother Watson:

"But as touching the ministering to the saints, it is superfluous for me to write to you: for I know the forwardness of your mind (they had a mind to give), for which I boast of you to them of Macedonia, that Achaia was ready a YEAR ago (no doubt made her pledge at the last Convention), and your Zeal hath PROVOKED very many. (Wholesome emulation is another good Convention policy, but it "pesters" the Landmarkers mightily.) But have I sent the brethren (Financial Agents), lest our boasting of you should be in vain in this behalf; that as I said, ye may be ready. (He had been making "an everlasting howl for money" to the churches of Macedonia about the promptness and liberality of the Church at Corinth, and they must not fail him now at a pivotal point in the collection. This is straight Conventionism, and it greatly "pesters" our brethren.) Lest haply if they of Macedonia come with me, and find you unprepared, we, that we say not YE, should be ASHAMED in the same confident boasting. (How Convention-like! The churches ought to have some denominational pride, and they ought to be ashamed of themselves when they have none.) Therefore I thought it necessary to exhort the brethren (the Financial Agents), that they would go before unto you, and make up beforehand your bounty (still "howling about

money"), whereof ye had notice before (they were duly notified that the money was wanted), that the same might be ready, as a matter of bounty, and not of covetousness. (He did not care to filch it from them, but he wanted it, and he was making an "everlasting howl" about it; and no doubt it "pestered" many of the brethren.) But this I say, He which soweth sparingly shall reap also sparingly; and he that soweth bountifully (hear it, Brother Watson) shall reap also bountifully. (He wanted money, and he wanted lots of it.) Every man according as he purposeth in his heart, SO let him give; not grudgingly, or of necessity: for God loveth a cheerful giver." (2 Cor. 9:1-7.) It's enough to "pester to death" anyone that will steel his heart against an appeal like that, and try to berate and besmear, and blight and blast and blot the work of generations, and become confederate with the Hardshells in their war on Foreign Missions. But in spite of the opposition already developing, the Apostle is still unrelenting in his cry for MONEY. He knew the corrupting influence of the golden dust, and he warns Christians against its mighty power:

"For the love of money is the ROOT of ALL EVIL, which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows." (1 Tim. 6:10.) One must lose his manhood and become an Idolater before he can LOVE money. The Apostle says that covetousness IS idolatry. (Col. 3:5.) One may be *fond* of money, but before he can LOVE money he must so far degenerate and pass out of the human sphere, and below the animal sphere, that he reaches the sphere of the mineral kingdom, where he can set his affection on the

gods of "gold and silver, graven with art and man's device," and so far lose the genius of a real man that he becomes an *idolater.* He can then be any thing that gold would be, and do any thing that gold would do. Our Lord wants us to make money our servant, and not become its slave. It's an awful thing to be an *idolater,* hence Paul kept up "an everlasting howl about money," which Brother Watson says "pesters our Landmark brethren nearly to death." Covetousness is one of the worst of sins. It's the most universal sin. It's the most universally unconfessed sin. The Lord required *the people* to KILL Achan for his covetousness (Josh. 7:); thence for one thousand years the priests, and kings, and Prophets "kept up an everlasting howl about money;" with "line upon line and precept upon precept" the Lord tried to burn into their hearts the right use of money, and keep them from the idolatrous worship of the money-god. But in spite of all this teaching and training, and painstaking oversight, Israel bankrupted herself through covetousness; and as the curtain fell in the days of Malachi, Jehovah exclaimed in Prophetic voice: "Will a man rob God, yet ye have robbed Me, this whole nation." (Mal. 3: .) For four hundred years God's voice was hushed into silence and Israel was left alone, the victim of "covetousness which is idolatry." (Col. 3:5.) With the institution and growth of the Church appeared again the death-dealing influence of covetousness. Covetousness made Judas Iscariot object to Mary's expense account, although it cost him not a cent. (John 12:1-6.) The indignation that declared her benevolent act a "waste" of money was engendered in the disciples by the love of money. They said: "Why was this waste of the ointment

made?" but Jesus said, "Let her alone; why trouble ye her? she hath done what she could." (Mark 14:1-10.) For her unselfish sacrifice, Jesus declared she should have honorable mention "throughout the whole world wherever His Gospel should be preached." What a comment on those cynical Christians of the present day who put the dollar mark on a living soul. So atrocious was the crime of covetousness that, when Ananias and Sapphira sought to practice deception on the public mind by withholding a part of the price of their lands, the Lord would not commit their destruction to the *hands of man, as He did in the case of Achan,* but He showed His disapprobation of this awful sin by slaying them outright Himself before the public Treasury, and refusing to inform their family or invite them to the burying. One should think that such a funeral would forever put an end to covetousness in the church; but not so. Paul found it necessary to keep up "an everlasting howl about the use of money," and to warn the churches against its corroding influences: "Charge them that are rich in this world," said he, "that they be not high-minded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy. That they DO GOOD, that they be rich in GOOD WORKS, ready to distribute, willing to communicate." (1 Tim. 6:17-18.) Is not sending out missionaries, preachers and doctors like Paul and Luke, women like Phebe (Col. 4:14; and Rom. 16:1), blacksmiths, carpenters, farmers, or one of any reputable calling, who can more readily come into touch with the home life of a lost people, a GOOD WORK? Is not building church houses, and schools, and colleges, and seminaries, and hospitals, and Bible houses, and print-

ing houses, a GOOD work? It's so considered in this country, why should it be thought an evil work in the lands where they need them most to carry on the work of the Lord? If God puts it into the hearts of his people to do a work like that, who are those brethren who have spent the best of their days in just such work, that they should pronounce such an enterprise a "waste" of money, *a cheat and a fraud?* Jesus says: "Let them alone, they have wrought a good work." But we are not through, Brother Watson.

6. Says Mr. Watson: "Something of the feeling of romance and novelty tempts men into Foreign Missions." (Exposure, p. 42.) Is language like that likely to encourage Foreign Missions, or to convince men that its author is an ardent friend to Foreign Missions of any kind? Such language is found not infrequently in their missionary literature. Ben M. Bogard, Editor, Arkansas Baptist, under the title of MISSIONARY DELUSIONS, says:

"The romantic feature of Foreign Mission work causes many young people to imagine they want to be missionaries. The trip across the ocean, the strange customs of foreign people, the heroic adventure, *the thought of having their praises sung from a thousand pulpits, and their names published widely in the newspapers,* brings on a MENTAL DELUSION (Bogard ought to know, he says he tried it.—Ed.) which makes the young hopeful think he is the very stuff first-class missionaries are made of. *We have had some experience along this line.* We once thought we ought to go as a missionary to Africa. We had read of Livingston, and Stanley, and Captain Baker. We had read of elephants, boaconstrictors, big red ants,

the Great Desert, cocoanuts, apes, tropical fruits, perpetual summer, and incidentally that some NASTY, *degraded negroes* lived there who might be won to Christ. *With this MIXTURE in mind we even went so far as to make* a DATE with a committee of the Richmond Foreign Mission Board, at Nashville, Tenn., when the Southern Baptist Convention met there twenty years ago. (This was just one year before the Gospel Mission movement began to crop out under Crawford et al., in China. Keep this in mind.—Ed.) But we never met the committee and right glad we are of it (the committee could no doubt reciprocate the compliment, if they have kept up with Bogard's career.—Ed.), for if we HAD it is probable that the present Editor of the Arkansas Baptist would have been BUYING NEGRO GIRLS in the Congo country *and palming them off as converts to Christ."* (Ark. Baptist, March 30, 1910.)

Is there any evidence in this quotation from the Editor of the Arkansas Baptist, in A. D. 1910, that is calculated to lead the reader to believe that the author of such language concerning the most unfortunate of Adam's race, who confesses with hilarity and shameless ridicule that he was moved to practice deception on the Foreign Mission Board: is there any evidence in the foregoing language that would indicate that he has ever been, is now, or ever shall be, sincerely in favor of any mission work whatever on the Foreign Field, or anywhere else among the colored race? We recognize the degraded condition of the negro race, and their subordinate position in society, but had never thought of ridiculing or insulting them, and trying to increase their already intolerable and complex burdens,

as the best means of inducing Landmark Baptists to fall out with the work of the Foreign Mission Board and the Southern Baptist Convention. Read again Tom Watson's own words, compare them carefully with Bogard's just given, and we believe that you will agree with us that, for irreverence about holy things, for disrespect and flippancy in religious matters, for buffoonery and the demagogue's appeal to prejudice, for lowflung insinuations and "superfluity of naughtiness," and for toploftical tomfoolery, these disgruntled Landmark Leaders take the cake. If Bogard's words, just given, mean what they spell, the past twenty years have utterly failed to erase that "Mental Delusion." But we are not through with Brother Watson.

7. Mr. Watson has taken such a dose of socialism and populism, and other Isms, that he has just about become a straight skeptic. Read again what he says. He takes the position fair and square that the religion of Pagan nations will make as good Christians as the Christian religion—"just as good as we are." "That a heathen who lives according to the best light he has will be saved. Is it not the general BELIEF, in this AGE of INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM, that a Mohammedan, a Buddhist, or a disciple of Confucius, who HONESTLY believes in the religion of his Fathers and does his utmost to live according to its teachings, WILL NOT BE DAMNED TO EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT?"

"The Creeds of these people, when faithfully observed, MAKE GOOD MEN; and will the Father of us ALL send GOOD PEOPLE to broil in an eternal hell?" How is that for Landmarkism? And Bogard, and Webb, and Matheny indorse him. Bogard says: "Thank God for Tom Wat-

son." (Ark. Baptist, 3-30-1910.) Webb says: "Let every lover of TRUTH pray God to give Tom Watson a glorious victory for the TRUTH." (Ark. Bap., 1-5-1910.) Matheny says: "There are thousands on thousands who are satisfied that Mr. Watson is telling the truth. Oh for a THOUSAND Watsons" (Ark. Bap., 2-2-1910). All these are Editors of the Arkansas Baptist, the mouthpiece for these modern Landmarkers. Talk about HERESY, HOTBEDS OF HERESY, Chicago University can't hold Tom Watson a light; yet these Landmark Leaders indorse him, and advertise his journals in their State paper. But don't blame Tom Watson. Being more capable and intellectual than the others who have been leading the Landmark deflection, *he has grasped the genius of this whole Gospel Mission movement.* The less observant reader may now understand why the Landmarkers are so much opposed to Foreign Missions, and have been fighting it under the mask of Mission Methods: Like their new, and most capable leader, Tom Watson, who has "come to the kingdom for such a time as this," they teach that the Heathen Religions are as good for Heathen countries as the Christian religion is for our country; and Watson says: "Let us have no NARROW-MINDED foolishness about this: ask any honest scholar and he will tell you that these Eastern peoples had a beautiful, refining code of morality long before Christians met in Convention to VOTE the adoption of THESE separate writings which constitute OUR Bible." "For hundreds of years Cuba and Mexico have been Christian, JUST as EUROPE is Christian, and JUST as Armenia is Christian. It is certainly a phenomenal state of affairs, when the Churches of THIS country are asked to

put up the CASH for missionary work among peoples who have been Christianized for AGES." Such is Gospel Missions, modern Landmarkism. Should we wonder that Bogard and other exponents of this nebulous system, who are trying to mobilize so many conflicting elements under the general note of opposition to Conventions, should have been laboring under "Mental and Mission Delusions" for twenty years? Watson has given us the real genius, the quintessence, the theological EXTRACT of Landmarkism, which being interpreted simply means: An organization of discordant nonaffinities which fight each other every time they meet in their General Associations, but finally agree to stand together in their opposition to Conventions and Convention work; it's just Hardshellism gone to seed. In proof, take what the Hardshells say, make the comparison for yourself and be convinced.

HARDSHELL TESTIMONY.

The Hardshell opposition to Boards and Conventions and outside societies was projected and promoted by the same mode of attack, only, be it said to their credit, with more consistency.

JOHN TAYLOR

Wrote his pamphlet, THOUGHTS, etc., Oct. 27, 1819 The familiar charges of "greed and the love of money and ease, place and power," etc., is patent in all their literature. Note their similarity with modern Landmark indictments. Notice also that they begin their fight on mission METHODS, but end the fight a few years later by an unconcealed opposition to Missions. Just so with the Land-

markers: They started their fight on METHODS, under Bogard and others, but have ended it in outspoken opposition to any kind of Foreign MISSIONS as a "romantic mental DELUSION," under Thos. E. Watson, and Ben M. Bogard. But hear Mr. Taylor:

"The deadly evil I have in view is under the epithets or appellations of Missionary Boards, Conventions, Societies, and Theological Schools, ALL bearing the appearance of great though affected sanctity, as the mystery of iniquity did in the days of Paul, when the man of sin was in embryo." (Thoughts, etc. Genesis of Antimissionism, Carroll, p. 97.) Doesn't that sound natural? But he continues: "The missionaries have many hooks by which they *rake the world for money.* Giving much money being the best evidence that a man is a Christian-Heaven is almost secured to them; as also an honorary seat in any of their councils on paying one hundred dollars. . . . Money and power were the signs of the times when the mystery of iniquity began to work in the days of Paul. The same principle is plainly seen in the great Board of Missions in America, and Rice, their chief cook, as also in their great Conventions. Money and power are the two principal members of the old beast. That both these limbs are found in *this young beast* is obvious, and exemplified in the great solicitude of CORRESPONDENCE with all the Baptist Associations. Power is acquired by connection with a hundred Associations, a fine nest-egg of gold to answer their future ambition." (Idem., pp. 103-5.)

"I consider these great men are verging close on an ARISTOCRACY," continues Mr. Taylor, "with an object to sap the foundation of Baptist republican government."

(Idem, p. 106.) He further says: "Why this mighty solicitude in these men to constitute churches? The MOTIVE is obvious. In the first place there *will be fine tales to write the great BOARD;* (just what Bogard and Watson say.—Ed.) and secondly, every church thus set up by themselves will be under their own immediate control." (Idem, p. 106.) Another writer says: "The Convention Board system is today the most dangerous enemy to Baptist principles on earth, because it is an enemy inside. It is Episcopacy in Baptist clothes; it has gained the confidence of Baptist ministers and churches; it has ridden into popularity on the Back of missions; it has established a practical Episcopacy in Baptist mission fields; it has secured control of the mission treasury, and now after a hundred years, it is making a secret (how could it be secret when Scarboro knows all about it?—Ed.) and well planned attack on the independence of the churches," etc. (J. A. Scarboro, B. B. B., p. 269, one of the Leaders among the Landmarkers). Reader, which of these two authors is the best Hardshell? But we introduce another Hardshell, namely,

DANIEL PARKER,

who wrote about 1820, and, like our Landmark brethren, tried to conceal his opposition to missions by his war on mission METHODS; but finally, like our Landmark brethren, came out boldly against MISSIONS, Bible Societies, and Schools for the heathen. He writes at some length defending himself against the accusation that he was opposed to these things. He says:

"(1) That we are opposed to the spread of the gospel among the heathen. To this I answer, we are pleased with

the spread and growth of Immanuel's kingdom throughout the world. But we wish it under his direction and government, and crown him with glory which we believe is not the case in the Mission PLAN.

"(2) We are charged with opposing the translation of the Scriptures and the education of the heathen. To this I answer the charge is incorrect, for we oppose neither; but will help it with heart and hand if it could be taken in a PROPER MANNER, and take the evils from it.

"(3) We are charged with holding a tyrannical principle, inasmuch as we are not reconciled to our brethren in their giving THEIR money to the MISSION SYSTEM, and the argument is that they have a right to do what they please with their own, etc. To this I answer: If the mission SYSTEM be an evil, and God has never required it at your hands to give the blessings he has bestowed on you to support an UNSCRIPTURAL PLAN, THAT is repugnant to his gospel government," etc. (Carroll, p. 110.)

"We stand opposed to the mission PLAN," continues Parker, "in every point and part where it interferes with or is CONNECTED with the ministry, either in depending on the church to give them a call, or Seminaries of learning to qualify them to preach, or an established FUND for the preacher to look back upon as a support, and when the Board *assumes authority to appoint the fields of their labor,* we believe they SIN in attempting a work that alone belongs to the Divine Being. The object of the missionary societies in respect to the minstry we are opposed to in EVERY POINT." (Idem. pp. 111-112.) That sounds just like an article from the Arkansas Baptist, and much of the Landmark literature. Bogard says:

"Opposition to unscriptural METHODS is not opposition to MISSIONS itself." (Ark. Bap., 4-20-1910.) Again Bogard says: "We do not believe there ought to be any denominational schools. Let the individual and the State educate, and let the Churches evangelize." (Landmark Baptist, 4-20-1904.) W. M. Webb, another Editor says: "Of course, everyone knows that Jesus never commissioned His churches to build SCHOOLS," etc. (Ark. Bap., 5-11-1910.) J. A. Scarboro says: "The education fad is a great talisman to conjure Baptist pocket books. The colleges and Seminaries are the hotbeds of heresy." (B. B. B., p. 414.) J. H. Milburn, on this point, says: "Of all the blighting and withering curses with which the Baptist cause has ever been cursed Theological Seminaries have been and are the WORST." (Mission Methods, p. 221.) Again MILBURN says: "Notably among presumptious SINS can be safely classed infant baptism, sprinkling and pouring for baptism, Prelatical, Diocesan and Archbishops and Corresponding Secretaries who, together with Boards, manipulate and manage ministers, fixing their salaries, *assigning them their fields of labor,"* etc. (M. Methods, p. 65.) If Daniel Parker is a Hardshell, all these other authors are; they are just alike—the same nationality, the same tribe, the same vernacular. Again Parker says:

"We have to acknowledge that the gospel has been conducted, directed and supported for *nearly eighteen hundred years without* such a plan as the Board has prescribed." (Idem, p. 118.) On this point hear the Landmarkers. J. A. Scarboro: "Churches did work for *seventeen hundred years without* BOARDS, and that, too, in the dark ages, and it may be that churches NOW could and would work

WITHOUT boards." (B. B. B., p. 11.) J. H. Milburn: "Baptist churches got along for *seventeen hundred years* WITHOUT choosing any OTHER organization through which to evangelize the world, than the churches of Christ." (M. Methods, p. 282.) Which class is the best Hardshell?

Take another comparison. Parker says: "The mission society applies under the character of religion to the enemies of Christ for help, and therefore casts contempt on his dignity. Members of these societies obtain their seats and authority here by PAYING their money," etc. (Idem. p. 121.)

J. H. Milburn says: "All the organizations contributing funds to the Southern Baptist Convention, and all those who contribute money to the State organizations, co-operating with the Southern Baptist Convention in mission work, are engaged in the OBNOXIOUS work of buying and selling votes." (M. Methods, p. 126.) If one of these is a Hardshell, both of them are. They are twins on the mission question. Take another, Parker: "The mission spirit does not appear from MY view like the Spirit of Christ. I verily believe it is one of the flood-gates of hell." (Idem, p. 121.) J. A. Scarboro: "The Convention Board System is today the most DANGEROUS enemy to Baptist principles on earth. It is a peril such as Baptists never faced before." (B. B. B., p. 269.) Tell us, ye conservators of Baptist orthodoxy, which of these men is the Landmarker, and which the Hardshell. Are they not of the "same kith and kin"? As late as 1843, Daniel Parker, one of the founders of the Hardshell church, wrote as follows:

"Now which is of God? The present '*mission effort*

spirit,' reduced to a system unknown to the Bible, as pertaining to the gospel, without CHURCH AUTHORITY, or US, ANTI to that course of things, who are contending for scriptural ground, CHURCH AUTHORITY, and gospel order, in sending or spreading the gospel." (Benedict, His. Bap., p. 788.) Hear again J. H. Milburn: "Well did Christ say: 'Every plant, which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up,' Matt. 15:13. God has neither planted Conventionism nor will anything of the kind abide the test incident upon the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. The WHOLE TRIBE of *human inventions* undertaking the evangelization of the world and yet not subject to CHURCH AUTHORITIES and control are so many tares among the wheat." (M. Methods, p. 87.) Both the Hardshells and Landmarkers alike sought to conceal their opposition to missions under the plea of *church authority.* But according to J. H. Milburn, the Landmark Associations will ALL be destroyed with "the whole tribe of human inventions." The arguments stand thus:

1. "Every plant which my heavenly Father hath NOT planted shall be rooted up."

2. But our heavenly Father did not plant the Landmark Association; Bogard and Milburn et al, planted that in April, 1902;

3. Therefore, the Landmark Association shall be ROOTED UP, J. H. Milburn being witness.

Farewell, Brother Landmarkers, we hope for you a cool journey.

Gibert Beebe, Editor Signs of The Times, established 1832 for the Hardshells when they separated from the Regular Missionary Baptists, said in 1839:

"The New School Baptists, with all their new inventions, sorceries, witchcrafts, proselytes, merchandise, doctrines and moneyed institutions, will go DOWN with old Babylon, like the millstone, and rise no more forever." (Editorials, Vol. I., p. 481.)

But we must content ourself with only one or two or more comparisons: In their address at Black Rock, Md., Sept. 28, 1832, when the Hardshells separated from the Missionaries, they object to Conventions and Mission Societies because of their "Authority to *appoint females and school masters, and printers, and farmers, as such,* to be solemnly set apart by prayer, and the imposition of hands, as missionaries of the cross, and to be supported from these funds." (Feast of Fat Things, p. 16.) Doesn't that sound natural? Now hear a Landmarker, W. M. Webb: "Of course, everyone knows that Jesus never commissioned his churches *to build schools, pay school teachers to teach the heathen grammar, arithmetic, carpenter work, farming, blacksmithing, and pay board for the pupils out of the Mission Fund.*" (Ark. Bap., 5-11-1910.)

These Landmarkers think they have made a brand new discovery; but they are just using the very arguments the Hardshells used 78 years ago. Pretty bad, when the Landmarkers have to steal a Hardshell tug-boat to attack the army of Israel in. Brother Webb is just 78 years behind the times. Take one more parallel. From the same Hardshell address, p. 20, we read:

"As to Theological Schools, we shall at present content ourselves with saying that they are a REFLECTION upon the faithfulness of the Holy Ghost, who is engaged according to the promise of the great Head of the Church to lead

the disciples into all truth. See Jno. 16:13. Also, that in every age, *from the school at Alexandria down to this day they have been a real PEST to the church of Christ."* J. A. Scarboro: "The education fad is a great talisman to conjure Baptist pocketbooks. God established a theological school in his churches; the Holy Spirit is the Teacher and the Bible is the Text Book. *The colleges and seminaries are the hotbeds of heresy."* (B. B. B., p. 414.) Tom Watson: "It's a sin and a shame—a burning wrong and disgrace—that we should be *forcing these missionary schools upon the alleged heathen* when we need them so badly for millions of our own boys and girls." (Foreign Missions Exposed, p. 94.) You are 78 years behind time, Brother Watson. The Hardshells, who do not claim any education, used identically the same argument to arouse the prejudices of the unlearned 78 years ago. Moreover, these Hardshells claim that THEY were the first in modern times to draw the sword against these missionary societies and Theological schools. On this point Daniel Parker says: "It is evident that great talents have been engaged and much time and money spent to vindicate the mission PLAN, and as yet but little said or done against it." (In 1820, according to Daniel Parker, opposition to Mission societies was a brand new thing.—Ed.) "It makes me shudder," he continues, "when I think I am the FIRST one, that I have any knowledge of, among the thousands of zealous religions of America that have ventured to draw the sword against the error, or to shoot at it and spare no arrows; and more particularly when I know that I lack that qualification that is pleasing to the Spirit of the world, for I have no education but to read, and have no knowledge of

the English grammar only as my Bible has taught me; but all the apology I shall make for my grammatical errors are, that God has chosen the foolish things of this world to confound the wise—therefore I will venture." (Gen. Anti., Carroll, p. 108.) The Hardshells adopted the same mode of attack on mission plans in 1832 that the Landmarkers do today. In their address, p. 14, they say:

"We cannot fellowship *the plans* for spreading the gospel, generally adopted at this day, under the name of Missions; because we consider those PLANS THROUGHOUT a subversion of the order marked out in the New Testament. The Lord has manifestly established the order, that his ministers should be sent forth BY THE CHURCHES. But the Mission plan is to send them out by a Mission Society." This was 78 years ago. On this point Ben M. Bogard says: "The only organized effort recognized in the New Testament for the work of missions is the local congregations of baptized believers. Any other organization that may undertake the work is a usurper, a lawbreaker, no matter how good the intention of such organization may be." (Bap. Way-Book, p. 24.) This was two years ago. It would take a Philadelphia lawyer to tell the difference between this Landmarker and that Hardshell.

We are to "hold fast the FORM of sound words," and we are to "keep the ordinances as they have been delivered unto us" (2 Tim. 1:13; 1 Cor. 11:2), because obedience to these lies in obedience to their FORM. But nowhere are we commanded, and there is not a hint anywhere that we are expected to "hold fast the form of plans" or "do the missionary work just AS the New Testament churches did." The Apostles themselves did not have a uniform way of

doing mission work among themselves. Hence much of Paul's instruction on Missions is given as ADVICE, and not by commandment. (See 2 Cor. 8: and 9:.)

We are commanded to GO, but no specific command is given as to the means to be used. Not so with the Ordinances and the Doctrines. Boards and Committees, Conventions and Associations, Societies, etc., are in the order of MEANS, and not in the order of commandments. Any means which does not contravene some expressed command of Christ, may be used in the propagation of the truth among men. This is the only sound principle of interpretation for our marching orders as found in Matt. 28: and Mark 16:. If the example of the Apostles is to be followed strictly in the order of means, then we must throw away the printed page, the Apostles had none; they wrote every page with goose quills. We must dispense with publication societies; the Apostles had none. We must ignore every modern means of rapid transportation—steamships, railroads, electric cars, EVERYTHING; the Apostles had nothing of the kind.

We must do away with modern schools, either public or denominational, for the Apostles had nothing of the kind. We must dispense with every kind of Sunday School Literature, either Landmark or Convention Series, for the Apostles had nothing of the kind. The Hardshells insisted that we use NO MEANS in the propagation of the gospel that the Apostles did not use. The Landmarkers make the same plea. Such nonsense ditched the Hardshells as it must ultimately do their Landmark or Gospel Mission Descendants. Gilbert Beebe, the Hardshell's oldest and ablest Editor, said in 1839:

"We differ from the new order in regard to the formation of Missionary Societies, because they are *unauthorized* in the Scriptures." (Signs of The Times, Editorials, Vol. I., p. 547.) In 1840, he said: "As fine feathers make fine birds, the Baptists have changed their plumage, and now appear among the peacocks of the age. Now the Baptists have their Doctors of Divinity, their Colleges, their National and State Conventions; their churches occupy stately mansions with sounding bells and towering domes." (Idem, Vol. I., 590.) Of course, they had no sounding bells nor towering domes. Why should our Landmark brethren have these things? Again, in 1840, he said: "The Old School Baptists, as a body, disclaim all connection with, and fellowship FOR religious societies of every name, object and pretense, excepting the church of God." (Vol. I., 637.) Doesn't that sound Landmarky? Read again Bogard, Milburn, Scarboro, and Webb. In 1841 Beebe said: "The Predestinarian Baptists are the only people on the earth that love the gospel of Christ, and these are the only people under heaven that will publish the gospel from a sincere love of it." (Vol. I., 651.) That sounds exactly like the Landmarkers.

Again: "We cannot, without doing violence to the Word, suppose that the churches are *to make lords of their ministering servants;* to rob themselves and families of the comforts of life, in order to pamper *and enrich their preachers,* to make merchandise of them, or of the gospel." (Editorials, Vol. I., 673.) On page 675 Beebe says: "We do not believe in preaching by the day, by the month, or by virtue of any CONTRACT between the preacher and his people." (Read Luke 10:7; and 2 Cor. 11:8.) But like

the Landmarkers, the Hardshells become more intolerant as the years go by. Like the wasp, they are largest when hatched and sting worse with age. In 1842, Beebe said: "In the long dark catalogue, Bible, Missionary, Tract, Religious Education, Abolition and Temperance Societies, Infant, Sunday and Theological Schools, Protracted Meetings, Monthly Concerts, National and State Conventions, *as organized bodies,* occupy very prominent places; and as none of them can bear the light and scrutiny of the Scriptures, and none of them can prove themselves of heavenly birth, we consider them ALL the brood of their Armenian mother, *whose house is the way to HELL, leading down to the chambers of death.*" (Vol. I., p. 748-9.) But age does not abate this intolerant spirit. In 1843, Editor Beebe, of the work of the Michigan Baptist State Convention, made use of the following complimentary (?) remarks: "Base slander. It's the whore of Babylon, whose name is in her forehead, "Mystery; Babylon the Great, the Mother of Harlots, and Abominations of the Earth," and Michigan and ALL her sister States are even now drunk with the wine of her filthy cup. . . . The New School Baptists do oppose the government of our Lord Jesus Christ, preach false doctrine in His name, deny the faith of God's elect, prostituting the ordinances of the gospel, believe that gain is godliness, etc. . . . Are your hearts made of granite, that you should withhold your money when these panting, burning, agonizing, longing, brainless, lazy, greedy, pining youngsters feel as though they cannot do without it? . . . To require it, as the Convention does, is adding to the words of the Book of God, and to demand it in the name of Christ, without his

order, is FORGERY." (Editorials, Vol. II., pp. 406-7, 8.) Volumes could be filled with such vituperation from the literature of these malcontents among the Hardshells and modern Landmarkers.

This same spirit is rife in the Hardshell literature of 1910. "I have my first missionary to see who is conscientiously working for the good of the natives, and I have seen about 35 of them." (Arthur C. Schenck, Primitive Baptist, quoted approvingly in Baptist Trumpet, Oct. 6, 1910. Both Hardshell papers.) "The practice of laboring in one field and drawing your support from another is foreign to the teaching of God's Word." (R. H. P., in Primitive Baptist, quoted in Baptist Trumpet, Nov. 24, 1910.)

Let the reader recall the charges of "*fraud, padded reports, heresy,*" etc. extant in the Landmark literature of the present day, and he will agree with us that they are the lineal descendants of these Hardshells, both in spirit and in practice.

THE CAMPBELLITES, ALSO,

Had their part in the Hardshell rupture of 1832. They were a heterogenous organization, consisting, like the Landmarkers, of many conflicting faiths, but rallying around ONE NOTE of opposition to Conventions, Societies, etc. No doubt Alexander Campbell did more than either Taylor or Parker to make the Hardshell division complete. Being much more intellectual, and a born leader, he brought his learning and wit and ridicule into requisition, and played upon the ignorance and prejudice of the hoi populoi with marvelous success. Like the Hardshells and Landmarkers, the Campbellites are a denomination of critics, malcon-

tents—a bundle of negations, an organization of agitators. The Gospel Missioners or modern Landmarkers have adopted the same policy. In 1823 Campbell began his irate opposition to Conventions and other societies, and many of his followers adhere to his positions to this day, although he died president of a Publication society. In his earliest writings Campbell stood just where our Landmark brethren stand today on the mission question. For the information and delectation of our readers we give a few extracts from his own pen; note the striking similarity between A. Campbell, and Bogard, Milburn & Co. Campbell says:

"The societies called churches, constituted and set in order by those ministers of the New Testament, were not fractured into missionary societies, Bible societies, education societies; nor did they dream of organizing such in the world. The head of a believing household was not in those days a president or Manager of a Board of Foreign Missions; his wife the president of some female education society; his eldest son, the recording secretary of some domestic Bible society; his eldest daughter, the Corresponding secretary of a mite society; his servant maid, the vice president of a rag society; and his little daughter, a tutoress of a Sunday school. They knew nothing of the hobbies of modern times. In their Church Capacity ALONE they moved. They neither transformed themselves into any other kind of Association, nor did they fracture and sever themselves into divers societies. They viewed the church of Jesus Christ, as the scheme of heaven to ameliorate the world; as members of it, they considered themselves bound to do all they could for the glory of God and the good of men. They dare not transfer to a Missionary society, or

Education society, a CENT or a PRAYER, lest in so doing they would rob the church of its glory, and exalt the inventions of men above the wisdom of God. In their Church Capacity Alone They Moved." (Christian Baptist, pp. 6-7.)

Again, Campbell ridicules the use of modern utilities in the following language: "Our devotion exhibits itself in Prayers, in the set phrase of pompous oratory; in singing choirs, etc.; in revivals, camp-meetings, praying societies (no wonder the C-ites have such opposition to praying for sinners: it was born in them.—Ed.), theological schools, education societies, missionary societies, Sunday schools, and in raising large sums of money by every way that ingenuity can devise, for propagating the gospel." (Idem, p. 7.) Doesn't that sound SO much like some speech before a Landmark association? Again Campbell says: "The missionary work was done. The gospel had been preached to all nations before the end of the apostolic age. The Bible, then, gives us no idea of a Missionary without the power of working miracles. Is then the attempt to convert the heathen by means of modern Missionaries, an unauthorized and hopeless one? It seems to be unauthorized, and, if so, then it is a hopeless one." (Idem, p. 15.) What familiar language, that. But again: "With regard to Bible Societies, they are the most specious and plausible of all the institutions of this age. No man who loves the Bible can refrain from rejoicing at its increasing circulation. But every Christian who understands the nature and design, the excellence and glory of the institution called the Church of Jesus Christ, will lament to see its glory transferred to a human corporation. The church is robbed of its charac-

ter by every institution, merely human, that would ape its excellence and substitute itself in its place. The honor and glory of the Church require that in its OWN CHARACTER (that is, without a Bible society, of course.—Ed.) it present and disseminate, in their purity the Oracles of God. Let every Church of Christ, then, if it can only disseminate twenty Bibles or twenty Testaments in one year, do this much. Then it will know into what channel its bounty flows (same appeal to suspicion and distrust among the Landmark brethren.—Ed.) it will need no recording secretary, no president, no managers of its bounty." (Idem, pp. 33-34.)

Like Bogard and Webb and Milburn and Watson and Scarboro, Campbell protested that he was not opposing Missions, but the METHODS employed; but, as in their case, his own words prove him to be really against Missions. Like them, also, Campbell appeals to the great *sums of money spent* to arouse prejudice: Hear him: "As to missionary PLANS, I am constrained to differ from many whom I love and esteem. Look at the *sums of money squandered at home and abroad* under the pretext of converting the world; and again, *wherein is the heathen world benefited by such conversion?* (Just like Watson and Bogard.—Ed.) Is the hand of the Lord in this business? Does he work in it as in the days of yore? Look at our own country—our Indian neighbors and our African bondmen. Are not these, equally as the Japanese or the Burmans objects worthy of our sympathy and regard? I do not oppose, INTELLECTUALLY at least (neither do the Landmarkers oppose missions intellectually, but they do in argument and practice.—Ed.) the Scriptural PLAN of

converting the world. My opponents do represent me as opposing the means of converting the world, not wishing to discriminate, in my case at least, between a person's opposing *the ABUSES of a good cause, and the cause itself.* (The very plea Bogard makes.—Ed.) I did contribute my mite and my efforts to the popular missionary cause, *until my conscience forbade me* from an acquaintance with the abuses of the principle." (Idem, pp. 71-72.) The Leaders among the Gospel Missioners make the same claim for their opposition to the present missionary policies. And, like Campbell, their conscience did not forbid them to work with the Conventions until, for some reason, they had lost out with the Convention. (See Addenda.) Following this principle, Campbell, like the Landmarkers, finally drifted into downright opposition to Associations and all kinds of organizations except the local church. (See Milburn, Scarboro, Webb, and Matheny, quoted elsewhere in this book.) On this point Campbell says:

"Whether such an alliance of the Priests and the nobles of the Kirk be called a Session, a Presbytery, a Synod, a general Assembly, a Convention, a Conference, an Association, or Annual meeting, its tendency and result are the same." (Idem, p. 73.) The Landmarkers can't beat that trying to arouse prejudice. Yet A. Campbell died President of just such a society as he condemns. The only difference between A. Campbell and the Landmarkers on *this point* is: Campbell started out wrong and got right, but the Landmarkers started out right and are going wrong. After quoting Campbell as opposing all kinds of societies, Joe S. Warlick, one of the leaders of the most arrogant wing of the Campbellite Church, has this to say: "I am

sure that if Mr. Campbell were alive today, he would oppose with all the vehemence of his soul, all the societies that are now sapping the life from the original stalk, the Church of Jesus Christ. The Missionary societies NOW are not what they were when Campbell was here, and he did not like what they had then, then, of course, he would condemn what we have now." (Joe S. Warlick, Editor, Gospel-Guide, Aug. 13, 1910.) The Hardshell-Baptists, the Landmark Baptists, and the Hardshell-Campbellites are a unit in their opposition to regular Missionary Baptists. So it appears that the Landmarkers, in their fight on mission Methods, are just a cross between the Hardshells and Campbellites.

CHAPTER V.

Landmark Secession.

We now undertake to show that modern Landmarkism, which began organic form in the year of our Lord, 1902, like Hardshellism, was a secession from the Regular Missionary Baptists. They "discarded Conventions" and Boards, and are thereby the exact counterpoise to the Hardshell deflection, themselves being witnesses. A few Landmark brethren who opposed Conventions and Boards, which, as Editor Bogard says were used by all Missionary Baptists until 1832, and which are used by Missionary Baptists at the present time, as every informed Baptist knows, met with Antioch Church, in the suburbs of Little Rock, Ark., April 10-11, 1902, and passed the following Resolution, in connection with their Statement of Principles, namely: "Resolved, That we invite the brethren of the State Convention to so adjust matters and METHODS of mission work as to recognize the sovereignty of the churches and their rights to instruct their messengers, and in other ways to so MODIFY their methods of work that we can co-operate harmoniously in our denominational work." (Minutes, 1902, p. 5.) The Convention has always recognized this right of the Churches, as every Arkansas Baptist well knows. But the leaders in this Landmark defection had failed to control the Convention at Hope, in

1900, and at Paragould, in November, 1901, and so, like the Hardshells in 1832, they proposed to declare nonfellowship, and leave the Regular Missionary Baptists. Dr. W. A. Clark, for years Editor of the Arkansas Baptist, offered the foregoing Resolution, which was accepted by Ben M. Bogard, L. Quinn, J. G. Doyle, Committee on Statement of Principles. This new organization of Landmark Baptists, and this assault on the Convention and its work came as a surprise to some who remembered that W. A. Clark, the Author of that Resolution, had been a strong advocate of the Convention for years, and a member of the State Mission Board as late as October, 1901, and that Ben M. Bogard had declared in his book on Christian Union, only eight years before, that Boards and Conventions are Scriptural and all Baptists used them until 1832, and by his pen advocated the Arkansas Baptist State Convention as late as October, 1901.

In the Arkansas Baptist, Oct. 9, 1901, Ben M. Bogard, now Editor of the Arkansas Baptist, under the caption, My Position on the Mission Question, had this to say: "Whereas, Some have been persistently misrepresenting me concerning this matter, I beg leave to state PLAINLY that I am heartily in favor, first, of the Churches; second, of the associations, and, third, of the Baptist State Convention. I want to preserve the Associations, the State Convention, and our State Mission Board. Whoever says I am opposed to the State Convention or its work misrepresents me."

In the same issue of the Arkansas Baptist, Oct. 9, 1901, Dr. W. A. Clark, then Editor, delivered himself as follows: "The Arkansas Baptist is in favor of organized

work and believes that churches have a right to meet in Association and Convention to advise about their work. Therefore, we favor associational Boards and our State Convention Board. Let no man say we are opposed to them. *The Editor is NOW a member of the State Board.* We advise all the Associations to remain in the State Convention. Separation will do no good." In the Arkansas Baptist, January 25, 1901, Dr. W. A. Clark had this to say: "For twenty-five years we have stood loyally by the Baptists of Arkansas and all their work as constitutionally represented in the State Convention. The Paper has always been absolutely in favor of the interests fostered by the State Convention and its Editor has in all these years pleaded for the State mission work, Sunday School work and higher education."

Dr. Clark was Financial Secretary of the State Mission Board, and held other positions under the Board for years, under the present policy of the State Convention. The Convention pursued identically the same policy, also, when Ben M. Bogard so heartily indorsed it, and vehemently upbraided those who insinuated that he was in the least "opposed" to the State Convention or the State Board. But after the indorsement of this policy for "twenty-five years," Dr. Clark would have the Convention. "So MODIFY their methods of work that we can co-operate harmoniously in our denominational work." Without doubt, those who want to "modify" or change the methods which have been in vogue, according to Ben M. Bogard, ever since the days of the Apostles, are the Innovators. The fact that in 1902 they wanted the Convention to "MODIFY" the methods of work which the Arkansas Baptists had indorsed

for twenty-five years proves conclusively that the Convention is standing by the "ancient landmarks which the fathers have set," and that these modern Landmarkers have changed and "modified" the policy which they heartily indorsed until 1901. *They are the Innovators,* themselves being witnesses. Another evidence that these modern Landmarkers have forsaken the Old Paths is found in Article XI of their Statement of Principles, adopted at Searcy, Ark., at the second session of the Landmark association Oct. 31 to Nov. 3, 1902, as follows: "We invite all the Baptist churches of Arkansas, and we would not exclude any beyond our State borders, to DISCARD CONVENTIONS, with their unscriptural METHODS and Corresponding or Missionary Secretaries, called by whatever name, and associate themselves with US. We shall never agree to an ORGANIZED UNION or association with any body of men unless the office and work of Corresponding Secretary be ABOLISHED, and we DEMAND that ALL Missionaries be sent out according to Acts 11:22, 23, and Acts 13:1-3, and that they report back to the sending church, Acts 14:25-27, and that the churches co-operate in the support of the God-called, Church-sent missionaries, 2 Cor. 11:8." For the arrogant arrogation of the MOST superlative arrogance, that assembly of disgruntles takes the prize. Not, since the memory of man runneth not to the contrary, hath such a body of commanding little dictators met in holy conclave. No wonder there have been wars and rumors of wars, and men's hearts failing them with fear. No wonder the earth has been trembling from Maine to the Golden Gate, and the geysers been in constant eruption, under the tread and at the "DE-

MAND" of such a Council of religious dignitaries! They DEMAND that the Churches send out missionaries a certain way, and they DEMAND that these missionaries report in a certain way, and they even DEMAND that the churches co-operate in their support. It's enough to make those medieval Baptists who gave their blood for the independence of the churches turn over in their graves. Not a Baptist Convention ever met on earth that ever had the remotest semblance of the shade of the shadow of such arrogant disrespect for the Churches.

Ben M. Bogard, now Editor of the Arkansas Baptist, was a member of this Committee. The same Ben M. Bogard who says in his book on "Christian Union," which he has been selling until 1910, that the "New Testament settles the question of Missions, Conventions, Boards," etc. The same Ben M. Bogard, who said that "Boards, Conventions, etc., were the principal causes of the division," that the "Hardshells do not practice those things, therefore, they are NOT the Primitive Baptists." (Christian Union, p. 64.) If the Hardshells were not Primitive Baptists, because THEY do not use Conventions and Boards, it follows that the Landmarkers are not Primitive Baptists because they do not use Boards and Conventions. See? (See Ms., p. 73.) See? This is the same Ben M. Bogard who said, Oct. 9, 1901: "I am heartily in favor of the Arkansas Baptist State Convention. I want to preserve the State Convention and our State Mission Board. Whoever says I am opposed to the State Convention or its work misrepresents me."—Arkansas Baptist. Only thirteen months later this same Ben M. Bogard, historian (?), Editor (?), scholar (?), author (?), pugilist, DEMANDS

that independent, sovereign churches of Jesus Christ "discard Conventions and Boards" which, he declared, had been used from the days of the Apostles until Oct. 9, 1901. Reader, Who has left the old paths? These pseudo-leaders declare that they have "discarded Conventions and Boards," which have been the settled policy of all genuine Baptists from the days of the Apostles.

Landmarkism is a brand new departure, it's an innovation, themselves being witnesses. And it was reserved for them to be the only general body of Baptists in the world that DEMANDS certain things of the royal churches of Jesus Christ. They are not only the most modern of Baptist deflections, but they are decidedly the most arrogant. They NOW say, after eight years bush-whacking, that Conventions and Boards and Theological seminaries are the inventions of men, and hotbeds of heresy. Like the wasp these leaders get smaller and smaller and more inflammatory as they increase in littleness. Who will not agree with us that this whole Landmark movement is another innovation, a brand new departure, from old-time Baptist practice. It's a modern innovation, just one step further away from Regular Missionary Baptists than the Hardshell schism of 1832. It is decidedly the youngest Baptist schism, a new denomination of only a few years.

M. P. Matheny, Moderator of the General Association of the United States, 1910-11, says:

"I have nothing to cover up or keep back from the people. The Gospel Mission Movement was a DISTINCT movement AWAY from Conventionism." (Ark. Baptist, June 1, 1910.) Another of their Leaders, J. A. Scarboro, says: "Strong men, informed men, are leaving Conventionism and

taking strong ground against its innovations." (Plain Truth, Nov., 1909, p. 29.)

Editor Ben M. Bogard says: "The brother thinks we did wrong in REFUSING to work in the Arkansas State Convention. He thinks we would have DONE BETTER to STAY IN and keep up a FUSS." (Ark. Bap., 5-4-1910.) These men have acknowledged that this Gospel Missioner-General Association movement is a departure from Conventionism, which Ben M. Bogard, their leading Editor, says was the policy of ALL Baptists from the times of the Apostles until 1832; and everyone knows we have had the same Conventionism since 1832, and Bogard heartily indorsed it until 1902. This movement began just a few years ago, according to their own testimony. "I desire to give your readers a brief epitome of the HISTORY of the beginnings of this much misunderstood and misrepresented MOVEMENT." (G. P. Bostic, China, quoted in B. B. B., p. 163.) In 1903, J. A. Scarboro said: "The controversy has been on now eleven years." (B. B. B., p. 249.) 1903-11-1892. The same author says: "The little HANDFUL of opponents BEGINNING in 1891, have grown into many thousands, etc. It has come to pass that Gospel Missioners are respectable, and DISSENTERS to Convention Episcopacy can get a hearing where *ten years ago* (1899) they would have STARVED to death preaching their views on the subject in controversy." (Plain Truth, November, 1909, p. 29.)

So according to these defenders of Landmarkism, presumably the best they have, their movement began with just a *"little handful of opponents" to Conventionism less than twenty years ago.* They concede their MODERN ORIGIN.

Ben M. Bogard claims the honor of beginning this movement, the honor is also claimed for others. But all agree that this Landmark defection began not earlier than 1891. On this point Editor Bogard says: *"I feel a little PROUD of the fact that the FIRST GUN in the current controversy on MISSIONS was fired by ME."* (Ark. Bap., July 20, 1904.) Bogard ought to know. J. H. Milburn says: "He is the greatest oral controversialist in the United States"; and Bogard says HE fired the FIRST gun in this controversy. If this Gospel Mission movement began in the days of the Apostles as some of the uninformed contend, Ben M. Bogard is NOW nearly twice as old as Methuselah. This might account for his theological vagaries and his mission somersaults. J. A. Scarboro says the movement started in 1891-2, and Ben M. Bogard declares HE "fired the FIRST Gun" against Conventions and Boards which, he says in his book, have been used by Baptists since the days of the Apostles. John the Baptist fired the first gun for the Missionary Baptists about 1880 years ago; but Ben M. Bogard fired the FIRST GUN for the Landmark Schism less than twenty years ago. Landmarkism is a Schism, an Innovation, not yet twenty years old, themselves being witnesses.

John the Baptist fired the first Gun for the Missionary Baptists about A. D. 27-30, and Jesus instituted the Church, of the material prepared by John the Baptist, A. D. 30-31, about 1880 years ago. (Lu. 1:15-17; Jno. 1:29-47; Jno. 3:29.) Thomas Campbell fired the first GUN for the Campbellites about 1809-1810, and Alexander Campbell, his son, instituted the Campbellite Church, of the material prepared by Thomas Campbell, in 1811, at

Brush Run, Washington County, Pa., about 99 years ago. (See Memoirs of A. Campbell, Richardson.) John Taylor and Daniel Parker fired the first guns in the preparation of the material for the Hardshell Church, about 1819-1820, and Gilbert Beebe, Samuel Trott, et al, organized the Hardshell Church at Black Rock, Md., September, 1832, about 78 years ago. Ben M. Bogard fired the "first GUN" for the Gospel Mission-Landmark-General Association folks less than 20 years ago, and, after a belabored effort, helped to organize the first Landmark Association in the world at Antioch church, suburbs of Little Rock, Ark., April 10-11-1902. Like the Hardshell schism, the Landmarker deflection has already grown into a distinct denomination, declaring non-fellowship with all regular Missionary Baptists on the Mission Question. (See their own Testimony in this Book.) This modern Landmark movement is just another Schism, an INNOVATION of very recent date.

"Thus saith the Lord: Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the OLD PATHS, where is the GOOD WAY, and walk therein; but they said: We will NOT walk therein." (Jer. 6:16.) Is not history repeating itself?

"For I know this, that grievous wolves shall enter in among you, NOT SPARING the Flock; also of YOUR OWNSELVES shall men arise, speaking PERVERSE things, to draw away disciples after them." (Paul, Acts 20:29, 30.)

"Children of the heavenly King,
As ye journey let us sing;
Sing our Savior's worthy praise,
Glorious in His works and ways.

"We are traveling home to God,
In the WAY our fathers trod;
They are happy now and we
Soon their happiness shall see.

"Lord, obediently we go,
Gladly leaving ALL below;
Only Thou our Leader be,
And we still will follow Thee."

ADDENDA.

It should be no surprise that leaders whose sense of accuracy is not a little impaired, should be rather stupid in their statement of facts. They are just put together wrong.

1. Take the bold, but certainly unguarded, statements concerning the work of the Southern Baptist Convention in foreign lands.

In order to arouse prejudice, it would seem, they assume that the money handled by the Convention is misused. Such charges, they know, have weight with honest but ill-advised people. On this point J. H. Milburn says:

"When money is collected for one purpose and used for altogether another purpose it is as a matter of fact not only DECEPTION, but it is that which, in the common business transactions of life would be called right down DISHONESTY. Last year (1908) there was laid down at the feet, as it were, of the Foreign Board $402,000 to SCOOP OUT and DO with to its liking." (Mission Methods, p. 211.) This is just a sample of hundreds of pages cir-

culated in tracts and books by these self-appointed conservators of the faith. For reasons they left the conventions, after giving the best of their lives to convention work. But they must have a following, a constituency. They know that many good people are inherently opposed to aggressive movements, either in church or State, especially those movements that require money. They, therefore, arouse this native prejudice by creating suspicion and bringing wholesale charges against plans and policies, and against those who are in official position. This is the most effective weapon in the hands of the religious agitator.

One pound of pressure can drive a falling body DOWNWARD faster than one thousand pounds of pressure can drive it UPWARD: It is helped in its downward course by its own weight. A body moves the most rapidly along the path of least resistance. And human beings are the most easily led along the paths of their strongest inclinations. But a few observations:

(1) We agree with our critic and his co-agitators that money collected for one thing and spent for another thing without consent is wrong. We are together on that point. But

(2) We challenge his bold, unsupported assumption, that the money spent by the Board on Foreign fields for Carpenters and Blacksmiths and Physicians and Teachers, is MISUSED. We deny that it is money "collected for one thing and spent for another." If there is "deception or dishonesty," as he charges, the indictment lies at the door of our critic. He had the facts before his face which disprove his arrogant assumption. But there are none so blind as those who won't see. Article II. of the Constitu-

tion of the S. B. C. reads as follows: "It shall be the DESIGN of the Convention to promote foreign and domestic missions, and OTHER IMPORTANT OBJECTS connected with the Redeemer's kingdom, and to combine for this purpose such portions of the Baptist denomination in the United States as may DESIRE a general organization for Christian BENEVOLENCE, which shall FULLY RESPECT the independence and equal rights of the churches."

This information, vital as it was to the issue involved, was before his eyes when he wrote the foregoing slanderous indictment. He either did not want the truth, or he wanted to pervert the truth, or both; he may take either horn of the trilemma he chooses. Had he read only SEVEN short lines, without the purpose and effort to pervert them, he would have saved himself the arduous task of a belabored book of 287 pages filled and reeking with acrimonious charges of dishonesty and fraud against us for doing the very things for which the Constitution provides. Our Constitution provides not only for "foreign and domestic missions," but also for "OTHER *important objects* connected with the Redeemer's kingdom," and proposes to "combine such portions of the Baptist denomination in the United States as MAY DESIRE a general organization for Christian benevolence," etc. What law of God is broken, what rule of the Bible is transgressed, what principle of truth is subverted, by that Article in the Constitution or by the practice of what it provides for by those who "DESIRE" to do so? Did the early Christians spurn their Lord because he was a Carpenter? Did they fail to support

Luke because he was a Physician? Did they refuse to give Paul "wages" because he was a tent-maker?

Did they reject Levi because he was a tax-gatherer? Did they withhold their benevolence from Timothy because he was a Teacher? Did they drive the husbandmen home from the mission fields under the charge of "fraud and deception and the misuse of mission money," just because they were farmers? Who will affirm that they did? Did they not rather support the Carpenter and the Physician and the tent-maker, and the blacksmith, and the custom gatherer, and the Teacher, and the farmer? Did not God set some in the Church, Apostles, prophets, teachers, miracles, gifts, HELPS? (1 Cor. 12:28.)

Shall we cease our testimony for Christ, because the Apostles are all dead? Shall we give up preaching because the prophets have all deceased? Shall we call in our Christian Physicians from the mission fields because the gift of healing has ceased? Shall we call our Christian teachers from their God-given work of teaching the different tongues of earth, simply because some religious dyspeptic cannot learn Greek and Latin without a miracle? Shall we give up the "HELPS" which God has ordained for His glory and for the salvation of the lost denizens of earth, just because some religious crank has lost prestige with his denomination and got too peevish to work? Should we not rather, like Paul the aged, use all means available, that by ALL MEANS we might save some?

"For though I be free from all men, yet have I made myself servant unto all, that I might gain the more. And unto the Jews, I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law,

that I might gain them that are under the law; to them that are without law, being not without law to God, but under the law to Christ, that I might gain them that are without law; to the weak became I as weak, that I might gain the weak; I am made all things to ALL men, that I might by ALL means save some. And this I DO for the gospel's sake, that I might be partaker thereof with you." (1 Cor. 9:19-23.) It is a well-known fact that the opium vendors and the slave traders have brought the Christian religion into disrepute in China and Africa. Those who have been conceived and born and reared and trained under the deadening influence of heathen worship, have their hearts steeled against Christianity and our Western civilization. For these and other reasons they cannot be approached as are men and women of Christian lands. These facts, as well as the practice of the Apostles adverted to, have taught us that it were infinitely better for the messengers of God to adopt some calling in those lands which will bring them in touch with the home life of the people and give them a hearing when otherwise they would have none. It is not unscriptural to be "made all things to all men, that we might by all means save some; and this we do for the gospel's sake." (1 Cor. 9:22, 23.)

If a carpenter or a blacksmith or a farmer or a physician or a teacher, with the Word of God in his hand, should win a soul to Christ which he could not otherwise so easily win, he is not only carrying out the command of our Lord (Matt. 28:19, 20), but he is emulating the example of the early disciples.

Yes, we are not only carrying out the clearly stated provisions of our Constitution, *which is nobody's business but*

ours; but our Constitution also is clearly within New Testament principles. But before Jehovah, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Spirit, that I rather, a thousand times rather win the souls of men with a teacher's chart, or challenge their respect with a Physician's pill-bags, or plow the way into their affections with a farmer's share, or cut the way for truth into their hearts with a carpenter's chisel; then stand before Jehovah with a heart lacerated with the blade of persecution in the hands of disgruntled and faultfinding critics and claim the trophies won through the blood of Christ, than to use the money given for missions as some of our critics have done, going up and down in the land maligning the brethren and disrupting the blood-bought churches of Jesus Christ.

2. Of the State Conventions J. H. Milburn says:

"A Baptist State Convention CANNOT be found which will not admit societies and other organizations to represent on a plane of equality with the churches, and vote in the transaction of business." (Mission Methods, p. 124.) Remarks: (1) If this unqualified statement were true, what New Testament principle would be subverted? But (2) The only serious objection that we have to the foregoing accusation is, that it is not so, the reverend gentleman, from Union City, Tenn., to the contrary, notwithstanding. Article II., Constitution Arkansas Baptist State Convention, reads this way: "The Convention shall be composed of messengers from regular Baptist churches which are in sympathy with the principles and purposes of this constitution, and which DESIRE to co-operate with this Convention, and shall be entitled to seats upon presentation of their proper credentials, or satisfactory evidence

of their appointment. Each church shall be entitled to three messengers, with one additional member for every fifty members, or major fraction thereof, above one hundred." (See Convention Annual.) Why should a Brother with such ostensible learning, and with so much self-confessed erudition make a statement like that and put it in book form when he should have known that it was positively false. Echo answers why? Nothing but a Church can represent in the Arkansas Baptist State Convention.

3. All through the literature circulated by these Landmark Leaders (we do not censure the rank and file of their followers who have been misled) the claim is made that the State Convention also misappropriates money, that they take money appropriated for missions, and supplement pastors' salaries, where there are weak churches, help to maintain the Baptist Advance, and distribute other religious literature, etc. Of course, such appeal is to arouse prejudice among the unwary. What are the facts? Article 1, section 2, of the Constitution, says: "The OBJECT of this Convention shall be to preach the gospel throughout out State and to evangelize the world; to aid by appropriate and Scriptural means our destitute and feeble churches; to supply the State with *books and Tracts best calculated to inculcate the doctrines and ordinances of Christ and to stimulate missionary effort;* to encourage ministerial and Christian and general education and to gather and preserve denominational statistics." Is there one principle of that constitution violated by the policies of the Arkansas Baptist State Convention? Yet who has not heard the cry of "fraud and misuse of money." Why

do intelligent men resort to such misrepresentations to arouse prejudice and create strife and division?

4. When these accusations and insinuations fail, some of these leaders raise the cry of Bossism, usurpation of authority. And, since a sure enough Baptist does not propose to stand hitched anywhere, this plea sometimes appeals to those who have not informed themselves concerning the facts in the case. The Convention would not if it could, and could not if it would, exercise the least authority over the least Baptist Church in the least community of earth. In fact, the Convention is composed of those only who "DESIRE to co-operate with the Convention, who are "elected" by their respective Churches. The Constitution of the Arkansas Baptist State Convention positively declares:

"This Convention shall never exercise any authority whatever over any church, nor shall it in any way interfere with the constitution of any church or with the exercise of its functions as the only ecclesiastical body, but will always cheerfully recognize and uphold the absolute independence of the churches." (Article III.)

Then why should these Landmark Leaders make such appeals which are so much out of harmony with the cold facts? Is there not a cause? These are only a few of the many ways adopted by these Leaders to poison the minds of the brethren against the policies of Conventionism. Conventions were all right while these men were with them, but when they saw fit to "discard Conventions and Boards" then Boards and Conventions were all wrong. Charges of Fraud, Corruption, Embezzlement, accompanied with endless invectives, insinuations and innuendoes, have been

their stock in trade ever since they left the Conventions. Such a course leaves the impression that it was not so much convictions of truth and duty that caused them to "discard Conventions and Boards," as some other cause. Hence we raise the question:

WHY DID W. A. CLARK, J. A. SCARBORO, J. H. MILBURN AND BEN M. BOGARD LEAVE THE CONVENTION?

Their plea that the Board was usurping authority in electing Secretaries, Evangelists or Missionaries, and spending money for tracts, papers, or other agencies, will not stand the test. In Article V, Section 2, of the Constitution, we read:

"The Executive Board shall elect a Missionary Secretary to work under the direction of the Board, and they shall employ any other agencies, such as general missionaries and evangelists, office help, and any means, such as tracts, etc., which in their judgment may inure to the most speedy and rapid evangelization of our State and of the world." (See Minutes State Con.)

We have constitutional right for every thing we do. None but messengers from the Churches can represent in the Arkansas Baptist State Convention. There is, therefore, no usurpation of authority as these Landmark Leaders charge. Is it a misappropriation of money to do just what the Messengers of the churches in Convention assembled elected us to do? Such perversion of the plain facts is inexcusable, not to say down-right mean, in any Editor or Author. When we see SO MUCH Editorial petifoggery we are reminded of the two men who were reading the following inscription on a tombstone: "Here lies an Editor

and a truthful man." After reading the words carefully, one of them innocently asked: "Why did they bury BOTH men in the same grave?" It may never be known certainly just why these men left the Conventions, after they had spent the best of their lives in Conventions with earth's purest and best workers, like Eagle, and Eaton, and Pendleton, and J. R. Graves et al.; neither do we charge that they left out of insincere motives. But the evidence shows that while they got what they wanted they were strong Convention advocates, as late as 1901-2. And we believe it is our duty before God and our children, to give at least a few of the historical facts concerning these Landmark Leaders, and then let our readers decide for themselves why these men left the Convention.

W. A. CLARK

Was an advocate of our Boards and Conventions, as he confesses elsewhere in these pages, for more than twenty-five years. He had been Financial Secretary and held other positions under the State Board for years. See his own words. But he made a sudden change in 1902 and helped to organize the Landmark Association. Why his sudden change? The following conversation, which was published in the Baptist Advance, may help us to decide why Dr. Clark made such a sudden flop to the Landmarkers:

"The following conversation took place between a member of the Clarksville church and Eld. W. A. Clark, of the Arkansas Baptist, a few days after the Jonesboro Convention:

"Member—Brother Clark, we are without a pastor at Clarksville. Can you suggest someone for us?

"Clark—Well, I do not know just now; it may be that I could serve your church. The State Board will have a meeting in a few days to elect a Corresponding Secretary. They may elect me. If the members on the Board from the Associations are in the meeting I am sure I will be elected. If they are not there, Dr. Barton will be elected. If I am not elected Corresponding Secretary, perhaps I can be your pastor.

"A few days past, the Board had its meeting. Dr. Barton was elected. The same member met Brother Clark just after the Board meeting and remarked: 'Well, I suppose Dr. Barton was elected.'

"Clark—Yes, and the Baptists of this State have no more use for a Corresponding Secretary of Missions than a rat has for hair on its tail.

"The member referred to is ready to verify this statement.—J. T. Howell." (Bap. Advance, Sept. 24, 1902.)

Did the failure of the Board to elect Clark Corresponding Secretary have anything to do with his sudden change of mind about the Scripturalness of the Convention? Dr. Clark spent the best of his life in the Convention, and being on the Board he had every opportunity to know if things were going wrong. Next take

J. A. SCARBORO,

Who says: "We put twenty years, the BEST in our life, into the system, ignorant of its internal workings. As an honest man we had to leave it because deeply and eternally convinced that it was not of God." (B. B. B., p. 268, 1903.)

These words were written some time before June 25,

1903, when the author wrote the Preface to B. B. B. Then why did he leave the Convention? Certainly NOT because of "ignorance" of Convention policies. Because on January 28, 1902, just sixteen months and twenty-eight days before, he wrote the Preface to the fourth Edition of his GO-OLOGY, a booklet he wrote in defence of Conventionism, while he was doing mission work in Georgia and had every facility for knowing the work of Conventions that he has now. In 1902 Scarboro said of Convention Baptists:

"Of all people, WE have the key to right motives in our adherence to Bible doctrines, and to right METHODS in adherence to Bible practice. Freed from the cumbersome Machinery of Popery and Episcopacy, are we not in position to go at once? To send a missionary from every church if we wish? To utilize all the force in local churches without losing any aggregated or co-operative power?" (Go-ology, pp. 51-52.)

Could J. B. Gambrell beat that in defence of Conventionism? But he continues:

"Some object to the Methods used in prosecuting mission work, as they say, and therefore do not assist. It is easier to find fault than to make improvements. Many who object to the Methods used have no method of their own, proving thereby that they are without the WILL to obey the Lord. As a general rule, it will be found upon inquiry that those who object to mission work and Methods know little or nothing of either, but engage in a sort of wholesale criticism and object to everything and everybody in the work of missions. Investigation generally reveals the fact that those who are readiest to object to Methods

and criticise those who are trying to carry on the work of missions know little about it and care less. Tradition preserves many things that happened in the early part of this century in Georgia, among which is this scrap of doggerel on Indian missions:

> "'Away down there in the Seminole nation,
> A pine-bark pulpit, and a missionary station;
> They've all gone down to study out a plan
> To cheat the Indians out of their land.'

"The object of this versifier was evidently to associate missionaries and land-thieves in the minds of his hearers, and so stir up their prejudices against missions." (This very policy is now employed by Scarboro, Milburn, et al. See their own words elsewhere in this book.—Ed.) "I remember well, when a child, hearing so-called preachers ridicule missions and missionaries by the hour, charging them with various crimes, not the least of which was stealing the money collected for missions for their own use." (Is it not strange that Scarboro, Milburn & Co. are NOW doing the very things which so disgusted them when they were younger?) "Even so late as the past month a gentleman of undoubted veracity told me he heard but a short time since that it required a dollar to send a dollar to the missionary." (Similar charges are made today by these Landmark leaders.—Ed.) "Such people are not only willing to remain in gross and *wilful ignorance of the truth concerning missions,* but also willing to prejudice others like themselves against it by misrepresentation. The blind lead the blind, and all fall into the ditch of error." (Go-ology, p. 64.) (This is exactly what Con-

vention people are telling Brother Scarboro and his fellow-leaders today.—Ed.) But Scarboro continues: "Each State Convention constituent to the Southern Baptist Convention has a State Mission Board having the OVERSIGHT AND MANAGEMENT (this was true in 1892 and 1902, and is so today. But Scarboro was with them then; he is not with them NOW.—Ed.) of the mission work of the denomination in that particular State, the appointment of missionaries, collecting and disbursing of funds, etc. Address the Corresponding Secretary of the Baptist State Mission Board for the respective States." (Go-ology, p. 75.) But he continues: "No people in the world are better supplied with educational institutions than Baptists. For this purpose there are theological departments in most of our State denominational colleges, *but our BEST and only real Theological Seminary is that at Louisville, Ky.*" (We now have the Southwestern Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, Texas, under that Prince of living preachers and theologians, Dr. B. H. Carroll.—Ed.) "You cannot afford to throw your life away in ignorance when there are such possibilities to secure and use an education, and this institution can and will help you in a most GRATIFYING manner. For *full and accurate information concerning the work of the entire Baptist denomination, South and North,* with the names and addresses of all Boards, officers, Schools, colleges and Seminaries, male and female, missionaries, ministers, Conventions, papers, societies—in a word, if you want to find out ALL that can be known about Baptist institutions in the world, send for the American Baptist Year-Book to the American Baptist Publication Society, Atlanta, Ga., or

Philadelphia, Pa." (Go-ology, p. 76.) These are the words of J. A. Scarboro, the same Scarboro who is NOW SO intemperate in his denunciation of Conventions. They are quoted from GO-OLOGY, J. A. Scarboro, fourth edition, Statesboro, Ga. In his Preface to the fourth edition, January 28, 1902, Scarboro says: "We desire to record here our grateful thanks for the generous and timely assistance of the Pastors and churches, in selling this fourth edition of this work. We send it forth with the prayer that the Divine blessing may attend the reading and the readers." Thus in theory he endorsed Conventionism until 1902, but in practice he had been denouncing it for some years. Why did he leave Conventionism? Hear his own words:

"The writer cannot forget how, *when he was deprived of employment, support,* reputation, sympathy, and looked into the faces of his own dear children, beggared BECAUSE (mark his "because."—Ed.) their father had honestly and innocently written his views on a debatable question." (B. B. B., p 344, 1903.)

Here Scarboro positively avers that he lost his support, employment, before he left the Convention. Did this have anything to do with his leaving Conventionism? The following was received from Dallas, Texas, dated 7-16-1910, in reply to a letter of inquiry:

"Rev. Allen Hill Autry,

Nashville, Ark.

My Dear Brother: The facts you want are as follows: J. A. Scarboro was employed by the State Board of Georgia when I was President of Mercer. I knew him well. He was doing some special work. After a while it was deemed

best to elect a man to have special charge of that institute work and Scarboro was not elected. He then began his fight on the State Board of Georgia, and has been fighting Boards ever since. J. B. GAMBRELL."

Dr. Gambrell is now the able Editor of the Baptist Standard, Dallas, Tex. We will next take

J. H. MILBURN.

Milburn has been off and on, for and against, the Convention for several years. It's no wonder that he could not stay and work with the brethren whom he had mistreated. His reasons for leaving the Convention, like Scarboro's, are somewhat conflicting. Of the Arkansas Baptist State Convention, J. H. Milburn, then Editor of the Arkansas Baptist, said editorially:

"The Convention is over, and its final action on all questions *was so manifestly in the Spirit of our Savior* that we most heartily and earnestly join in helping to carry out all the wishes expressed and PLANS adopted." (Ark. Bap., Nov. 21, 1900.)

June 11, 1902, Milburn says:

"It was not until the Arkansas Baptist State Convention at Hope (Nov., 1900.—Ed.) that my faith in Conventions, Boards and secretarial management was completely shaken. It was the "spirit" manifested on the part of the Convention and its supporters more than all else which caused me to doubt the propriety of Conventions, Boards, Secretaries and other human expedients, etc." (Ark. Bap.)

Here this irate opponent to Conventions boldly declares that HE left the Convention because "its final action on all questions *was so manifestly in the spirit of our Savior.*"

Perhaps we should not gainsay the brother's statement, but we are inclined to think that the real cause of his hate for Conventions lies further back. No man can love those whom he has maltreated. We give the facts for what they are worth. *We owe it to our children, and our children's children.* The following records we take from the Minutes of the State Mission Board, in 1889:

"The Board met in the room of Hon. M. F. Locke, Capitol Hotel. Present: Jas. P. Eagle, President; J. B. Searcy, J. K. Brantly, W. E. Atkinson, A. W. Files, Treasurer, M. F. Locke and W. A. Forbes, Secretary. Prayer was offered by J. B. Searcy. The President then stated the object of the meeting: That Eld. J. H. Milburn, Editor of the Arkansas Baptist, had written to Hon. M. F. Locke a letter of very slanderous character about the members of the State Mission Board. He desired to know what steps should be taken in the matter. The letter was then read and the following resolutions passed and signed by all the Board:

" 'Whereas, in a letter written by Rev. J. H. Milburn to Col. M. F. Locke, on December 18, 1888, said Milburn used language charging: (1) That there existed in Arkansas a Baptist ring. (2) That the said Baptist ring, it was intimated, was composed of the State Board, is a corrupt body. (3) That the Baptists of the State were dominated by a few designing men. (4) That said so-called Baptist ring has murdered and is murdering the cause of Christ in the state. (5) He alleges unchristian and ungentlemanly conduct against Rev. W. A. Forbes, A. B. Miller and J. B. Searcy. (6) He uses language calculated to cast reflection upon the President of the State Board, Rev.

Jas. P. Eagle. (7) And casts a very serious reflection upon several members of the State Mission Board; and

"'Whereas, we disclaim any knowledge of any Baptist "ring" in the State, and if there be such a "ring" we desire to know it; and

"'Whereas, these several charges are very grave, we therefore demand of the said J. H. Milburn to furnish the following information: 1. The existence of the said Baptist "ring," of whom said "ring" is composed. 2. Who are the corrupt and designing men who are dominating over the Baptists of the State. 3. Who are the men who have and are murdering the cause of Christ in the State, and the means that have been and are being used. 4. We demand that he furnish the name of the Brother who says he is anxious to spend five hundred dollars in unmasking the corruption of the "ring." 5. That he name the facts that can be brought to light that will astonish the Baptists. 6. We demand that he be required to answer whether he has made similar charges to others than Brother Locke, either verbally or written; and 7. We demand that he make good the several charges and insinuations, or that he admit in writing that he has been guilty of misrepresentation and slander against the members of the State Board and the several Brethren herein mentioned; and 8. That unless he complies with the above demands that charges of slander and falsehood will be preferred against him in the church to which he is amenable; and that Bros. W. E. Atkinson, J. K. Brantly and A. W. Files be and are hereby appointed to deliver a copy of this paper to the said J. H. Milburn and receive his response thereto. Signed: James P. Eagle, President; W. A. Forbes, Secretary; A. W. Files, Treas-

urer; J. K. Brantley, J. B. Searcy, M. F. Locke, W. E. Atkinson. Moved that the Committee prepare charges against J. H. Milburn if he fail to give satisfaction.'

"June 4, 1889—State Mission Board met in Little Rock. The Board was called to order by the President, J. P. Eagle. The roll being called, the following named brethren answered: J. P. Eagle, President; A. W. Files, Treasurer; W. A. Forbes, Secretary; M. F. Locke, W. E. Atkinson. Minutes of the former meeting read and approved. The Committee appointed at a former meeting to prepare charges of slander and falsehood against J. H. Milburn, in case he refused to make good or retract his charges against the State Board, reported through Brother Files that he had sent by registered letter a copy of the resolutions at former meeting, but as yet had received no reply. Committee continued."

With that record before us, we think we should take his statements on the mission question with a grain of salt, when he professed such inordinate love for his brethren that it approached idolatry. His words are:

"There is such a thing as denominational idolatry. We are NOW confident (1908) that we loved the Baptist cause and the brethren *inordinately.* Since the writer underwent such a *conflict of mind* as he has, he is glad, yea, rejoices, in the fact that God has thus enlightened him and led him *to the point of a firm decision in regard to, and a steadfast dislike FOR, those innovations of men* which he had unwittingly learned to love, simply because they were Baptist institutions." (M. Methods, p. 20.)

Is it possible that Milburn's experience with the State Mission Board had anything to do with bringing him "to

the point of a firm decision and dislike" for Conventions? I'll not affirm that it did, but does it not look just a little suspicious?

It's a new theory in ministerial comity when one must turn enemy and fight his brethren, and make all sorts of false accusations against their work, and spend his time trying to disrupt churches, just to keep from "loving them inordinately, even unto idolatry." But we are in the age of new discoveries. Finally we ask: Why did

BEN M. BOGARD

leave the Convention? We deem it just to our posterity to let them know just how this man has been related to our mission work for the past twenty years. In 1890 Bogard applied to the Foreign Mission Board for foreign mission work. In 1894 he declared in his booklet, Christian Union, that Boards, Conventions, etc., were Scriptural. He was a member of the S. B. Convention in 1900, on the money basis. October 9, 1901, he said: "I want to preserve the State Convention and our State Mission Board." November 15-19, 1901, he said: "We commend the work of the Home Mission Board as worthy of our prayerful, moral and financial support, and we recommend that ALL our churches do ALL they can, as in their wisdom they deem best, for the promotion of this work in the South, and in the Island of Cuba." (Min. S. Con., 1901, p. 57.) *Bogard read this report and signed it with his own hand.* In April, 1902, he assisted in the organization of the Landmark Association, which opposes Conventions. And now he says: "Nowhere in the Scriptures do we read of a Convention appointing a Board or a Committee for any

purpose whatever." (Way Book, p. 27.) He says in the Arkansas Baptist: "I did buy a half interest in the Arkansas Baptist, back yonder, from Clark the Yankee, *just to get to fight the Boards.*" What has so enraged him against Boards and Conventions? We think there were two things, at least, which have incensed Bogard against Conventions—he failed to control the Convention at Hope, November, 1900, and at Paragould, 1901, and he failed to get the title of D. D. from Ouachita College because he wrote his own recommendation, which they thought no reputable minister should do. In defense of our opinion we give our readers Bogard's own words, from his own handwriting, which were published in fac similes in the Baptist Advance, March 18, 1903. The letters following were written to R. A. Moore, Eldorado Springs, Mo. Two of them were written to Dr. J. W. Conger. We give them just as he wrote them, insofar as they bear upon the D. D. proposition. Let our readers decide for themselves. Bogard is now one of the Leaders among the Landmarkers. Following are the letters; they explain themselves:

"Searcy, Ark., Dec., 12-1900.

"Dear Bro. Moore: Are you dead or asleep, or on a journey? What is the matter with you? I have not heard from you for two months at least. Now I don't know whether you would know me or not after the threshing I got at the Baptist State Convention. *They voted me down by a big majority and sustained Barton.* It was a mere happen so. The Baptists of the State are with me, have so expressed themselves by resolution at associations, but they stayed away from the Convention and the Bartonites

were all there. I don't believe he could have scared up a respectable man in the State on his side that was not there. I made a strong fight against odds but they outvoted me. I want to ask a favor. It is a favor, too, that you will be surprised at. *I want the title of D. D.* and it is in your power to get it for me. I know that with thinking people there is nothing in the title *but with the masses it means a great deal.* I want it because *by it I will be enabled to exert more influence.* The Southwest Baptist College, Bolivar, Mo., will, I am sure, give me title if a proper petition is sent in. What is needed is a lot of representative men to suggest it to the college and the work will be done. I can furnish you a list of names of representative men who will say I ought to have it and you can write to them and get what they have to say and embody it all in a petition to the college and that will end it. It will take about five dollars worth of postage, stationary, etc., for you will always inclose self-addressed stamped envelope to whoever you may write and I can furnish a good list. If you will agree to do me this kindness, I will forward you the money to pay for postage, stationary, etc., and with it a list of names and the form of letter you should write to each, etc. The work of getting up the petition ought to begin by the first of the year, to allow for delays in correspondence, etc., and to get in the petition in time for the Faculty and Trustees to act at their Spring meeting. Will you do me this favor?

Regards, etc. Of course the contents of this letter is strictly confidential. Yours as ever,

"BEN M. BOGARD."

"Searcy, Ark., Dec., 19-1900.

"Dear Bro. Moore: Your letter received. Thank you for your proffered services. I send a list of names and a letter form on other sheets for you to use. Begin the work of preparing the letters and self-addressed envelopes now but date all letters, Jan. 1, 1901. If you begin now and work at odd times you can get them all ready by that time without rushing and sending them in one mail on Jan. 1. Between now and that time I will send the $5.00."

Omitting some personal matters, Bogard continues:

"Here are thirty names of representative men, all of whom know me, and I think their answers will be favorable. Send all the answers to me and I will rule out any that I think will be unfavorable, and arrange them so as to make a good showing, and return it to you to make a copy on the typewriter, and then it will be ready to go to Southwest Baptist College, Bolivar, Mo., for their action. On another sheet I send form of letter. Ben M. Bogard." (Here follows list of names—and after them the Form of Letter.—Ed.)

"Eldorado Springs, Mo., Jan. 1-1901.

"Eld. ————————————

"My Dear Brother: I address this letter to you, with self-addressed stamped envelope, for your reply, to get your opinion concerning a matter in which I am interested. I am hoping that some college may confer the title of Doctor of Divinity upon Eld. Ben M. Bogard, of Searcy, Ark. I write to you to get your opinion about the matter. Do

you think he should have the title? By answering soon you will greatly oblige, Yours, R. A. Moore."

"Searcy, Ark., Dec. 28-1900.

"Dear Brother Moore: Please find enclosed $5.00 which will cover the expense of the correspondence *I have imposed on you.* I send ten other names on another sheet. Write them also. That makes forty letters for you to write and forty self-addressed stamped envelopes for you to enclose. One dollar and sixty cents in stamps besides your stationary at least. Besides you may have to further correspond with some of them. Then, when the petition is made out, you will have to write to the college and after the D. D. is conferred at least twenty letters must be written to as many Baptist papers so that they may let the fact be known, etc. It will take nearly $5.00 by the time you get through with it. Very truly yours, Ben M. Bogard."

(Here follows list of names.—Ed.)

"Searcy, Ark. Jan. 7-1901.

"Dear Bro. Moore: Your letter, stating that you had mailed the forty letters as I indicated, received. Eld. J. N. Hall, in writing to me on a business matter, enclosed the letter you sent to him and asked me not to give him away, as having told you, as you might (not—Ed.) want me to know it, etc. Of course I will not let you know that I know anything about what you are doing. It would be useless to inform you that I know you are working to get the D. D. for me and I am therefore not going to do it. If you find out that I am on to it, it is all right, but I

am not going to tell you. Do you understand? If some of the parties do not respond, write again and tell them you want their answer whether favorable or unfavorable. This is a good way for me to find out what the boys think of me anyway. * * *

Very truly, Yours,

"Ben M. Bogard."

"Searcy, Ark., Jan. 21-1901.

"Dear Bro. Moore: Your letter received ten days ago, and I have not answered because up to date I have had nothing to say worth saying. I expected the replies you received to be 'leopard like' as you expressed it. But we don't need to use the spots on the 'leopard' when we deal with the college. Write a letter to Prof. E. R. Graham, A. M., Bolivar, Mo., and ask him when a petition to the College for granting an honorary degree could be heard and acted on. Tell him that you intend to present such a petition for me. Don't hesitate to call my name as Graham and I are the best of friends. His answer will be a guide to you in sending the petition in. I should also be glad to see Prof. Graham's reply to your letter. * * *

"Very truly,

"Ben M. Bogard."

"Searcy, Ark., Feb. 18-1901.

"Dear Bro. Moore: Your letter received. You have succeeded well in getting so many and no doubt by this time all have answered who intend to do so. So send on the letters you have. If Prof. Graham has not answered

you yet write to him again. He no doubt, in the multitude of his cares, has forgotten it. Possibly the letter was lost. * * * Very truly yours,

"BEN M. BOGARD."

"Searcy, Ark., March 5-1901.

"Dear Bro. Moore: Your letter, and also the registered package of letters, received. I think the answers are remarkably favorable. The ones I most desired to give favorable answers have done so. And I am surprised that not one of them said 'no.' Some 'damned me with faint praise' but only one or two. Altogether the answers are satisfactory. I am especially pleased with Coleman's, Ford's, Moody's, Eaton's, Harvey's, Barker's, Doyle's, Spurline's, Gregston's, Hamlin's, Prof. Howell's, etc. Such an endorsement would, it seems to me, get anything for a man. And I forgot to mention Hall's—the best commendation of all. I shall draw up the petition in correct form and send it to you. Write at once to Eld. T. N. Compton, D. D., Henderson, Ky., and ask him if he will not personally present the petition, with the letters of endorsement, to the Faculty and Trustees of Bethel College, Russellville, Ky. He says in his letter that he will do anything in his power and asks you to 'command him.' Compton is the man to go before Bethel College. Compton is now at Henderson in a protracted meeting. Send the letters in care of Eld. W. F. Taylor. I shall send the books as you suggest to Bolivar. I shall present a copy to each of the other colleges also in due time. Of course I knew that some men were opposed to the title of D. D. and

I am not really in favor of it, but the title is given and the man who has it is elevated in the estimation of the majority of people and majorities rule in this country. * * * I certainly appreciate what several say, viz., *that I am too big a man to have such a title.* At least three say that. Of course they are mistaken. * * * Very truly yours,

"BEN M. BOGARD."

"Searcy, Ark., April 22-1901.

"Dear Bro. Moore: Your letter, with Wittenbraker's and Compton's letter, received. I thoroughly understand Compton. He is afraid Bethel College will refuse and he does not want me to fail. Send to him the petition—a copy of it—and explain that you will have it presented to two other colleges. If we fail there it makes no difference. I have drawn three forms. One for the Southwest Baptist College, Bolivar, Mo. and one for Bethel and one for Ouachita. Make these on your typewriter and seal them up one at a time as you make them and address them, as you might send the petition to one place when it was intended for another and that would never do. The petition is very brief as you will see. Just enough to call attention to the letters. Send the original letters to Ouachita, Arkadelphia to Prof. J. W. Conger, for the Trustees. Send copies to Compton for Bethel College and E. R. Graham for his endorsement and have him give it to President Burks for the Trustees. * * * *I carried off the laurels at the Minister's Institute at Arkadelphia.* Regards to all. Yours,

"BEN M. BOGARD."

(Following are the forms he drew up recommending himself which Moore was to sign and mail to these respective colleges.—Ed.:)

"Eldorado Springs, Mo., ————

"To Trustees Ouachita College—Gentlemen: I call your attention to Eld. Ben M. Bogard, of Searcy, Ark. He deserves the title of Doctor of Divinity and Ouachita College should confer that title. I call your especial attention the enclosed letters which I have received from representative Baptist preachers, who with one consent recommend that he have the Doctorate. Dr. J. B. Moody, of Hot Springs, Eld. J. G. Doyle, Little Rock, J. S. Thomas Searcy have written in such strong terms that I especially call your attention to them. Eld. T. T. Eaton, D. D. L. L. D., W. P. Harvey, D. D., J. S. Coleman, D. D. L. L. D., etc., of Kentucky, where Mr Bogard is favorably known, recommend that he have the title. I think the commendations sufficient, and the college would be *doing itself an honor* besides honoring a worthy man. Very respectfully, R. A. Moore, Pastor, Berean Church, Eldorado Springs."

(Of the next form we give only that part which differs somewhat from the foregoing.—Ed.)

"Eldora Springs, Mo. ————

"To Trustees Bethel College; Gentlemen: I call your attention Eld. Ben. M. Bogard, of Searcy, Ark., but well and favorably known in Ky. He deserves the title of Doctor of Divinity and Bethel College should give it to

him. He was a student of Bethel College but did not graduate. His career has been far in advance of almost any of the full graduates of his age. I refer you to, etc. Those who know Mr. Bogard best give him the strongest commendation. Bethel College would not only be honoring a worthy man in giving Mr. Bogard the title but would help herself by getting the influence of such a man to be used in favor of the college, *when but for such a recognition he might not remember the college. You need, I should think, some strong influence in your favor west of the Mississippi. Very respectfully,*

"R. A. MOORE, Pastor, etc."

(If I owed a man any amount of self-laudation and he wouldn't take that, I would schedule on him.—Ed.)

"Eldorado Springs, Mo. ————————

"To the Trustees of Southwest Baptist College, Bolivar Mo.,

"Gentlemen: I call your attention to Elder Ben M. Bogard, of Searcy, Ark., but formerly of Kentucky and for four years pastor at Charleston, Mo. He deserves the title of Doctor of Divinity, and I petition you to give him the title. I call your attention to copies of letters which I have received from representative Baptist preachers, who know Mr. Bogard well. These with one consent recommend that he receive the Doctorate. Very respectfully,

"R. A. MOORE."

"Searcy, Ark., May 4-1901.

"Pres. J. W. Conger, Arkadelphia, Ark.

"Dear Prof. Conger: Your letter received. Firstly: I

am not a candidate for the degree of D. D. Of course, if the degree is conferred, without my solicitation, I shall esteem it an honor not to be refused. Secondly: I am not a full graduate but have the degree of B. L. with three years work in Latin and Greek, etc. I completed the work in English and Philosophy at Bethel College, Russellville, Ky., and lacked one year of completing the B. A. degree. The records of the college I suppose will show what I say but as the faculty has been changed entirely since I was in college, I refer you to, etc. I am a native of Ky. and am thirty-three years old. Of course, I understand that Trustees do about what the Faculty ask them to do. But my interest in you and your work will by no means diminish if you cannot conscientiously recommend the degree. *I did not know that such a movement was on foot until a few days ago when Bro. Moore sent me the letters which he had received recommending the degree.* I appreciate the interest he has taken in me. * * * When you need me command me. Very truly yours,

"BEN M. BOGARD."

(We should say that Bogard's sense of accuracy must have been slightly impaired, or his bump of ministerial prevarication abnormally developed.—Ed.)

Here Dr. A. J. Barton, then Editor Baptist Advance, says:

"Between the date of this letter and the next, 'dr' Bogard had learned—as comes out in the letter of June 7—that Pres. Conger had had a conversation in which the facts as to the origin of his spontaneous demand 'that he

have the Doctorate' (were brought out.—Ed.). Being aware that Pres. Conger knew something of the facts, his mind underwent a rapid and radical change as to Ouachita, which he formerly valued so highly that the original letters must be sent there." (See Baptist Advance, 3-18-1903, p. 8.) But finally:

"Searcy, Ark., May 20, 1901.

"Pres. J. W. Conger, Arkadelphia, Ark.

"My Dear Brother: After mature deliberation I have determined that I do not want the title of D. D. from Ouachita. My reasons are as follows:

"1. If I am to get the title at all, I would rather it would come *from a college of greater reputation,* and which has been recognized as an established institution. In saying this I do not mean to underestimate Ouachita for I hold the college in high esteem, and rejoice in its prosperity.

"2. My position on current questions among Baptists is such that such men as A. J. Barton, W. E. Atkinson, H. H. Street, and N. R. Pittman, would be probably turned against the college if the degree should be conferred on me. I do not want to injure the school in the estimation of even one of my enemies, and I especially would not like to injure it in the eyes of my brethren. These brethren 'have it in' for me, and it has occurred to me that they might be turned against Ouachita if such a thing was done. I have nothing but kind feelings toward them, and would not want to cause them to lose any sleep over such a matter. If I am worthy of the degree it will come from another source anyway. So I write to request you not to present the matter to the Board of Trustees at all. In addition to

this I should be oblige to you if you will send to me the letters which Bro. Moore sent you together with the letters which I sent you, and all correspondence concerning the matter. I want this done so that by no means the matter may be presented to the Trustees. I should have to refuse the title if it should be conferred by Ouachita any way. * * * Very truly yours,

"BEN M. BOGARD."

That this same Ben M. Bogard should persist in misrepresenting Convention Baptists in his paper, and refuse to allow any correction whatever, will be no surprise to our readers in the light of this correspondence. To show that Bogard has been unscrupulous (he may have improved some lately; we have not seen the last issue of the Arkansas Baptist) when his own interest was at stake, we transcribe a letter from a Brother who has known Bogard for years, and was intimately associated with him. This letter shows that Bogard would not spare even his own friends when he wanted to carry his point. The letter follows:

"Lancaster, Tex., 7-13, 1910.

"Dear Bro. Autry: In answer to this letter will say, there was a stuffing of the ballot in the Fulton Baptist church in 1894. Ben M. Bogard told some of us he was going to nominate J. N. Hall but he didn't. After W. S. Roney nominated Hall, Bogard nominated B. F. Hyde. Hall got 22 votes and Hyde got 23. I made a motion to make it unanimous. On counting the members present there were only 34. We found the 22 that voted for Hall. Of the eleven votes STUFFED IN, 7 were in a hand-

writing exactly like Bogard's. The church rescinded the illegal act and Hyde never became pastor. Yes, Roney, I am sure, though now a 'Gospel Missioner,' so-called, will corroborate this statement in every particular. I have never known Roney to lie and I talked with him repeatedly about this while we were both living in Arkansas. Bogard admitted this to me in Paragould in the presence of R. A. Mahan and asked me not to use it against him. I have nc personal ill-will for Bogard. He has never been in my way in any sense that I ever knew about. The Lord bless you in all your labor to advance his cause. Frat.,

"T. C. MAHAN."

Mahan is the stuff we make men of. Was it a sincere conviction for truth which led these men to commence and to keep up this acrimonious and unbrotherly fight on Conventions and Boards, or was it a spirit of personal ambition and disappointment? We leave our readers to be their own judges. With hatred toward none, but charity for all, we give these facts to the churches of future days whenever and wherever this book shall be read.

May great grace be upon the work and the workers.

[THE END.]

Date Due

MAY 1 3 1981			

286.1767
A941

Autry, Allen Hill
AUTHOR
Grapeshot and canister from the arsenal of truth on mission
TITLE methods.

286.1767
A941 Autry, Allen Hill
Grapeshot and canister from the arsenal of truth on mission methods.

8311